

PENGUIN MASTERSTUDIES

'The best text and criticism on this book I have ever read.'

'A masterpiece; brilliantly produced.'

'This essay is of considerable interest and value to university students.'

Lecturers and teachers alike have praised this new series of short, critical studies on major literary works.

Written by such eminent scholars as Kenneth Muir, Gervase Mathews and C. L. R. James, Penguin Masterstudies are establishing themselves as critical texts in their own right.

Send off for an inspection copy now and judge the quality of Penguin Masterstudies for yourself.

New Titles



Inspection Copy Order Form

Name _____
Institution _____
Address _____

Please send me:

- ☐ Drama
- ☐ Essays/Perspectives
- ☐ Hamlet
- ☐ King Lear
- ☐ Measure for Measure
- ☐ All on the Stage
- ☐ The Merchant of Venice
- ☐ The Nurse's Tale
- ☐ Othello
- ☐ Prologue to the Canterbury Tales
- ☐ The Tempest
- ☐ Twelfth Night
- ☐ Twelfth Night
- ☐ Twelfth Night
- ☐ Twelfth Night

Send to: Academic Marketing Dept.,
Penguin Books Ltd., 300 Victoria Road,
Edinburgh EH6 3NU

The Times Literary Supplement

February 14 1986 Priory House, St John's Lane, London EC1M 4BX

Contents

HENRY GIFFORD	R. F. Christian (Editor and translator): <i>Tolstoy's Diaries - Volumes I and II</i> 155-6
ROY FULLER	Questionings (poem) 156
A. G. CROSS	Simon Karlinsky: <i>Russian Drama from its Beginnings to the Age of Pushkin</i> 156
JILL NEVILLE	John Bryson: <i>Evil Angels - The death of Azaria Chomberlain in the central Australian desert, and the events leading to judgement</i> 157
GEORGE BLAIN	Portia Robinson: <i>The Hatch and Brood of Time - A study of the first generation of native-born white Australians 1788-1828 - Volume One</i> 157
ADRIAN WGLDRIDGE	Raymond E. Fancher: <i>The Intelligence Men - Makers of the IQ controversy</i> 158
ANTHONY CLARE	Victor Serebriakoff: <i>Memo: The Society for the Highly Intelligent</i> 158
P. J. VATICIGITS	Richard Warner: <i>Recovery from Schizophrenia - Psychiatry and political economy</i> 158
ADAM WATSON	Tawfiq al-Hakim: <i>The Return of Consciousness</i> 159-60
RODERICK FLOU	Raphael Israeli: <i>Mon of Defiance - A political biography of Anwar Sadat</i> 159-60
GILLIAN TINDALL	Gilles Kepel: <i>The Prophet and Pharaoh - Muslim extremism in Egypt</i> 159-60
J. K. L. WALKER	Jimmy Carter: <i>The Blood of Abraham - Inside the Middle East</i> 159-60
CHRISTOPHER HAWTREE	Steven L. Spiegel: <i>The Other Arab-Israeli Conflict - Making America's Middle East policy, from Truman to Reagan</i> 159-60
ANNE CHISHOLM	Alan Dowry: <i>Middle East Crisis: U.S. Decision-making in 1958, 1970 and 1973</i> 160
NIGELLA LAWSON	Aubrey Jones: <i>Britain's Economy - The roots of stagnation</i> 161
ANNE DUCHENE	Jeremy Seabrook: <i>Landscapes of Poverty</i> 161
T. O. TREADWELL	William Camp: <i>Stroke Counterstroke</i> 161
RICHARD CLOGG	Pete Davies: <i>The Last Election</i> 162
ROSEMARY ASHTON	Guy Bellamy: <i>The Nudists</i> 162
MAGGIE GBE	Kazuo Ishiguro: <i>An Artist of the Floating World</i> 162
TRACY WARR	Michelle Wandor: <i>Guests in the Body</i> 162
RICHARD OSBORNE	Shena Mackay: <i>Redhill Rococo</i> 163
FRANCES SPALDING	E. L. Doctorow: <i>World's Fair</i> 163
ANDREW SAINT	Aesthetic freedom and the perils of sponsorship 164, 175
ANDOR GOMME	Letters on Disease and the Novel, Spender's 'Journals', 'Galileo and His Sources' etc 165
VALBRIE PEARL	Commentary
JULIAN MOYNAHAN	<i>Pride and Prejudice</i> (Glad Vic) 166
CHRISTOPHER BUTLER	Samuel Beckett: <i>Enough, Footfalls and Rockaby</i> (Riverside Studios) 166
NEIL BERRY	Jos Silkin: <i>Black Notes</i> (Pentameters Theatre) 166
ALAN BELL	Among this week's contributors 166
BRIAN ALDISS	Gloacbloo Rossini: <i>Moses</i> (Coliseum) 167
S. S. FRAWER	Philip Wilson Steer (Fitzwilliam Museum) 167
MICHAEL HGFMAN	Author, Author 167
MICHAEL BUTLER	Spiro Kostof: <i>A History of Architecture - Settings and rituals</i> 168
BLAKE MORRISON	<i>An Inventory of the Historical Monuments in the County of Northampton - Volume VI, Architecture monuments in North Northamptonshire</i> 168
ROY POSTER	Gary Stuart De Krey: <i>A Fractured Society - The politics of London in the first age of party 1688-1718</i> 168
HEATHER O'DONOGHUE	Jane Tompkins: <i>Sensational Designs - The cultural work of American fiction 1790-1860</i> 170
H. R. WOODHUYSEN	Colin McCabe: <i>Theoretical Essays - Film, linguistics, literature</i> 170
	David Castronovo: <i>Edmund Wilson</i> 170
	Nigel Cross: <i>The Common Writer - Life in nineteenth-century Orish Street</i> 171
	Brian Stableford: <i>Scientific Romance in Britain 1890-1950</i> 171
	Roger Paulin: <i>Ludwig Tieck - A literary biography</i> 172
	Volker Braun: <i>Hinze-Kunze-Roman</i> 173
	Christoph Hein: <i>Horns Ende</i> 173
	Heinrich Böll: <i>Frauen vor Flusslandschaft</i> 173
	Siegfried Lenz: <i>Exzerptplatz</i> 173
	John Prater: <i>The Gift</i> 173
	Judy Blume: <i>The Pains and the Great One</i> 173
	Mary Rayner: <i>Crocodiles</i> 173
	Mary Dickinson: <i>Jilly, You Look Terrible</i> 173
	Mira Lobe: <i>Christopher Wants a Party</i> 173
	Juliet and Charles Snipe: <i>Where Do the Wicked Witches Live?</i> 173
	Sally Grindley: <i>Knock Knock Who's There?</i> 173
	Niki Daly: <i>Not So Fast Songololo</i> 173
	Charlotte Zolnow: <i>I Know a Lady</i> 173
	Inga Moore: <i>The Truffle Hunter</i> 173
	Barbara Bolton: <i>Edward Wilkins and his Friend Gwendolyn</i> 173
	Pauline Baynes: <i>How Dog Begat</i> 173
	James Herriot: <i>Only One Wolf</i> 173
	Chris Van Allsburg: <i>The Mystery of Harris Burdick</i> 174
	Terry Jones: <i>Nicobobbin</i> 174
	Sale of books and MSS 175
	Index of books reviewed 175
Cover picture	Seigel, Nikolai, Dmitri and Leo Tolstoy: in <i>Childhood</i> Leo wrote "I was friends with Mitya and respected Nikolienka, but I admired Serezhka; I loved him and wished I were he". The picture is reproduced from Edward Crankshaw's biography, <i>The Making of a Novelist: Tolstoy</i> (276pp. Waldenfold and Nicol 0 287 76693 7). Henry Gifford's review of Tolstoy's diaries is on page 155.

Tolstoy alone with his conscience

Henry Gifford

R. F. CHRISTIAN (Editor and Translator)
Tolstoy's Diaries
Volume One: 1847-1894. 396pp.
Volume Two: 1895-1910. 359pp.
Athlone. £45.
0 485 11276 0

Of the ninety volumes that make up Tolstoy's works in the Soviet Jubilee Edition (1928-58), thirty-two are filled by his letters, and thirteen by the diaries and notebooks. Thus exactly half of his prodigious output belongs to what in most writers would be the background; but Tolstoy set no boundary between the public and the personal, literature and life. Literature for him must be a means to living, not an aesthetic pastime. Annenkov, one of the literary men he met in St Petersburg when his celebrity began, wrote to Turgenev of an astonishing discovery about this arrogant and cross-grained newcomer: nobody they knew was "so moral a character". The word Annenkov underlined is appropriate to Tolstoy pre-eminently among Russian writers. When an entry of 1853 in his diary claims "I've never yet met a man who was morally as good as me", the reader, shaken by an unparalleled record of vanity, utter absorption in self, coldness towards others and exploitation of women, still has to recognize Tolstoy's heroic capacity for the moral life, his dedication, renewed after every setback, to the one clear goal. The pursuit of individual perfection can be as ruthless as any other manifestation of genius. The artist is never satisfied, beginning afresh with every new work. Tolstoy was an artist in morality, rather than the saint he aspired to be - an artist whose draughtsmanship was often clumsy, but whose energy and passion continued to the last day.

R. F. Christian's engagement for some fifteen years with the letters and diaries has been a notable service to the English-speaking public. In 1978 the Athlone Press published a selection of the letters, translated and annotated by him, in two volumes. He was then persuaded to undertake this companion work. Having chosen the entries that best revealed Tolstoy as a writer, a moral and social thinker, and (so far as he could be in later life) a private person at home with his surprisingly patient family, on the estate among the peasants, or corresponding with his friends, Professor Christian then compared the selec-

tion with that made in two volumes of the 1965 Moscow edition. They have been brought to a fairly close similarity, but Christian's presentation is superior in several ways. He has checked and improved certain readings of the text, and has not spared Tolstoy the effects of his own damaging caudour. The diatribes against women ("weaker creatures spiritually", with no respect for male principled thought) had been passed over by his Soviet editors, and Christian does not censor Tolstoy's political comment. His translation is very scrupulous, the notes are well handled.

Tolstoy kept a diary, with certain gaps - above all during the time he was working on *War and Peace* and *Anna Karenina* - from the age of eighteen until a few days before his death. Boris Eichenbaum once described it as his "home university" in the early period. It was more precious to him than any novel or treatise he ever wrote, because here he confronted, almost every day, that severe taskmaster, his own conscience.

When Gorky met him at the turn of the century he suspected that Tolstoy's secret thoughts were never uttered, even in his diary. At the beginning he wrote with unabashed curiosity about the kind of man he was, studying himself under the tutelage of Sterne, that "intolerable observer" according to Pushkin. Tolstoy's self-exposure in the diaries was unremitting and often impatient. Though sensing his own superior powers, he was aware of many disadvantages in character and situation. When serving with the Army of the Danube, shortly before his move to besieged Sevastopol, he made an unflattering appraisal of himself at twenty-five. Lacking social position, self-educated in a piecemeal, haphazard way, immodest, irritable, lazy, cowardly and irresponsible, he loved goodness, but feared that given the choice he would be content with fame rather than virtue. The young Tolstoy is un-couth and angrily defensive. He could barely tolerate female company as "a necessary unpleasantness of social life". Among the countless pedantic rules for his own improvement, modelled on Benjamin Franklin, is one that spells social disaster: "Choose difficult situations, always try to control a conversation, speak loudly, calmly and distinctly, try to begin and end a conversation yourself." Having determined his procedure, he continues: "Seek the company of people higher in the world than yourself."

"Man was created for solitude... in a moral sense", he noted in 1851. The diaries were for

him the equivalent of the East room in *Mansfield Park* where Fanny could be alone with her conscience. Only in 1862, when he married, did Tolstoy's sincerity in the diaries come under threat, since Sonya would be reading them too. By 1897 he had come to regret the loss of "that religious feeling I used to have previously when I wrote my diary just for myself". The diaries were made to some extent into a weapon in his struggle with Sonya. When his domineering disciple Chertkov also began to see them, the contention between Sonya and Chertkov led to Tolstoy's flight from Yasnaya



Polyana. Now that his creative energy was turned mainly to didactic ends, the freedom of his diaries where, undistracted, he had once been able to inspect his moral life, mattered more to him than anything. "Perhaps they are necessary for other people, but for me I'm sure they are not just necessary - they are me. They are a good thing for me..."

"They are me." That is also true of all Tolstoy's fictional work, even his story of the horse trader. He resembled D. H. Lawrence in living out his "thought adventures" on every page that he wrote. Since Tolstoy's spectacular flight from home and much-publicized death, the stresses and contradictions of his personal life have been well known and endlessly commented on. This selection from the diaries does

not put that ordeal under any strikingly new light. However, it does show in much eloquent detail a tireless seeker whose strength derived from resistance to the age, even though his actual mode of thinking was inescapably marked by it.

When Tolstoy set down the last words in his diary on November 3, 1910, the nineteenth-century world was about to break up. The advent of modernism could already be discerned. Symbolism, its predecessor, had come to a crisis in Russia, and even this movement inspired Tolstoy with a deep aversion. The dogmatist of his public pronouncements had more in common with Chernyshevsky, whom he opposed on ideological grounds, than with Chekhov, for whom he felt an unusual tenderness. Chernyshevsky's straightforward utilitarian doctrines were at least intelligible to one who had admired Franklin, whereas the subtle counterpoint, the indeterminateness of Chekhov, especially in the plays, remained foreign to Tolstoy. As a young man he had prescribed for himself a régime that would have satisfied Chernyshevsky's rigorist Rakhmetov in the novel *What Is to Be Done?* Tolstoy remarked tentatively in his 1905 diary that "the intelligentsia has contributed a hundred times more evil than good to the life of the people". He found objectionable in Chernyshevsky and his followers the characteristic he had noted in Shaw - a "terrifying self-assurance". Yet Tolstoy, as occasion arose and as his needs dictated, would read the same books as the utilitarian radicals, and the engine of his rationalizing mind was a heavy structure from a nineteenth-century forge. The autodidact in Tolstoy, the polemical thinker trained in his "home university", derived, as did his adversaries, from the Enlightenment. In 1860 he recorded "an unusual dream - I thought how the strange religion of mine and the religion of our time is the religion of progress". But progress was "only the absence of belief". A few months earlier he had stated that God "is not being; He is law and might. Let this page stand as a memorial to my conviction of the power of the mind." Thirty years later he catches himself out saying "Help me, Father", and hastily adds: "I know there is no Father as a person."

But if Tolstoy the teacher and systematizer dominates the diaries, they show too the other, intuitive side of his nature. He disparaged poetry as a means of expression at odds with its form, yet he was repeatedly drawn to Tyutchev and Fet, whose sensitivity to the fleeting and mysterious attracted the Symbolists. The au-

CAMBRIDGE

Now in paperback

Elizabethan Stage Conventions and Modern Interpreters

ALAN C. DESSEN

Summing about four hundred manuscripts and printed plays to record the original staging conventions of the age of Shakespeare, Alan Dessen shows how Elizabethan spectators, less concerned with realism than later generations, were used to receiving a kind of theatrical shorthand transmitted by the actors from the playwright.

201 pp. 0 521 31161 6. Paperback £7.95 net.

Shakespeare's Poetics

EBERT PAAS

This is the first full-length study of the large and difficult topic of how Shakespeare viewed his own craft and creativity. The author concludes that Shakespeare's ideas of poetics occupied a place among contemporary theories which was surprisingly advanced, differing widely from mainstream Renaissance criticism and falling in line with the foremost thinking of the age.

277 pp. 0 521 30825 9. £25.00 net.

Wallace Stevens

The Poetics of Modernism

Edited by ALBERT GELPI

This collection of essays by seven renowned critics presents different views of Wallace Stevens' place in the evolution of Modernist poetry. By tracing both the development of Modernist poetics and Stevens' place in it, the essays range from discussion of the poet's relation to the contemporary scene such as Ezra Pound, William Carlos Williams and Marianne Moore to his influence on current writers such as John Ashbery and Robert Duncan.

176 pp. 0 521 30701 3. £19.50 net.

Cambridge Studies in American Literature and Culture.

Past Perspectives

Studies in Greek and Roman Historical Writing

Edited by I. S. MOXON, J. D. SMART and A. J. WOODMAN

The ten papers which make up this volume were originally presented at a conference on 'The Greek and Roman Historians' held at the University of Leeds in 1983. The articles range from investigations of the writings of Plutarch, Tacitus and Xenophon to the function of historical writing in Rome of the second and first centuries B.C.

250 pp. 0 521 26625 4. £25.00 net.

Now in paperback

Wealth and Virtue

The Shaping of Political Economy in the Scottish Enlightenment

Edited by ISTVAN HONT and MICHAEL IGNATIEFF

In the light of recent work *Wealth and Virtue* reassesses the remarkable contribution of the Scottish Enlightenment to the formation of modern economics and to the theories of capitalism. These essays combine scholarly analysis with a masterful synthesis and a deep appreciation of the complex and sometimes contradictory strands of Scottish political economic theory.

344 pp. 0 521 31214 0. Paperback £12.50 net.

History Today

Richard Strauss: Der Rosenkavalier

ALAN JEFFERSON

Written for the opera and general reader, *Der Rosenkavalier* contains a biography, bibliography, stage history, and illustrations of performance from its premiere to recent times. It describes the pre-eminent achievement of the collaboration between Hugo von Hofmannsthal and Strauss as the poet drew upon a wealth of historical and literary sources to fashion his vivid characters, while Strauss further enhanced their lifelike charm in his potent and magical score.

178 pp. 0 521 26036 1. Hard covers £22.50 net.

0 521 27811 3. Paperback £7.95 net.

Cambridge Opera Handbooks

North German Opera in the Age of Goethe

THOMAS BAUMAN

This generously illustrated book is the first study of the development of German opera from the first comic operas of Johann Adam Hiller at Leipzig in 1766 to the end of the century. Beginning as a basically literary genre, North German opera changed dramatically in response to two main trends: the contrast with the serious elements and style of tragedy and the triumph of German stages of the Italian, French and Viennese comic operas.

464 pp. 0 521 26027 2. £37.50 net.

Violence and Great Estates in the South of Italy Apulia, 1900-1922

FRANK M. SNOWDEN

This is a study of the harsh structure of profit, tenure and climate faced by landlords in the quasi-colonial South of Italy. It is also a powerful investigation of the appalling grim conditions to the agricultural centres of the region, and a vivid history of the struggle by farm workers to win the ordinary decent life, era shining in the process one of the most powerful revolutionary movements in modern Italian history.

235 pp. 0 521 30731 7. £25.00 net.

The Vatican, the Bishops and Irish Politics

Church and State in Ireland, 1915-1939

DERMOT KEOGH

A detailed study of the political relations between church and state in modern Ireland, this work is also an analysis of domestic politics within the context of Anglo-Vatican relations. It draws extensively on unpublished documents and, for the first time, explores with the aid of primary sources the exchanges between bishops, politicians and the Vatican over a twenty-year period.

320 pp. 0 521 30129 7. £27.50 net.

Cambridge University Press

The Edinburgh Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge CB2 2RU, England

thor of *Anna Karenina* was steeped in the controversies of the 1870s; together with *The Brothers Karamazov* this novel comprehends the range of Russian intellectual and moral experience at the time. However, Tolstoy, like Dostoevsky, argues with his opponents on more than one level; while *Resurrection* is largely a tract, *Anna Karenina* shows an apprehension of life richer and more primitive than that of the intellectuals. It is concerned with the power of instinct, the unpredictability of events, and the tragic potentiality in human relationships. That last perception was to be fatally revealed in Tolstoy's own marriage.

His life, as Eichenbaum once remarked, was a succession of crises; the quarrel with himself never ended. Lenin explained the general crisis underlying Tolstoy's contradictions as that of Russian society itself after the Emancipation of the Serfs in 1861 and before the Revolution of 1905. Tolstoy, of course, lived to witness that revolution and to make his own forthright and often penetrating comments upon it. His position, according to Lenin, was that of the patriarchal peasant, to which the process of social change had driven him. But this diagnosis, even if broadly true, scarcely reckons with the long perspective it opened, or the depth of experience Tolstoy encountered in the village outside his gates, or from the many pilgrims and questioners who came to see him. Tolstoy's response to the nineteenth century's iron-shod march towards mechanization was deeply traditional. It reflected the seventeenth-century dissident and martyr, Avvakum; and, in any sense religious, it was so in reforming little to do with the ethical post-Christian doctrine he preached. Lenin deplored him as a "holy fool", and in 1889 Tolstoy had declared in his diary a willingness to become "a

holy fool in my writing too". The temptation of flight from home, a taking to the road, was something entirely Russian, because freedom had always been found beyond the limits of government and the civilization it imposed.

Not long after he published *A Confession*, Tolstoy noted in an aside: "How Russians love the fundamentals of morality, without compromises." Coleridge he condemned later for suffering from "the English disease". Tolstoy granted, "he can think clearly, freely and powerfully; but as soon as he touches on anything that is respected in England, he becomes a sophist without noticing it". The youthful Tolstoy could turn into a sophist of another kind when persuading himself of the "obvious moral advantage" in having caught syphilis. But in his last years there are no traces of sophistry. We read the diary of a man who admitted only a few weeks before death that "in the matter of moral improvement" he still felt himself "a complete child . . . and a bad pupil, not very diligent". He was as quick as any of his critics to see the falsities in which he had been trapped, and he cried out, in Gorky's hearing as in his diary, to suffer. The comforts of his family life were for him "agonisingly shameful and terrible. Yesterday I rode past some stonebreakers, and it was as though I'd been forced to run the gauntlet" - a punishment in the Russian army no less drastic than keelhauling in the British navy. The government's policy of imprisoning or exiling his associates while he remained free could not have been more successfully calculated.

In April 1910 he recorded: "An insanely lovely spring. Each time I can't believe myself. Can this beauty really come again out of nothing?" He had been feeling the nearness of death; but when it was nearer still, in October,

on his walk he "felt particularly clearly and vividly the life of calves, sheep, moles, trees . . .". This awareness reduced the significance of human greatness, which others increasingly attributed to him. "The only thing we can wish of ourselves as men is not to do foolish things. Yes, only that . . .". More than the consciousness of having behaved well or done good work (a consciousness that seldom lasted for long), what reconciled Tolstoy to himself and the world was an infrequent sense of mysterious harmony in some moment, as in the spring of 1891:

I walk along a hard road, and nearby gaily dressed women are coming back from work singing lively songs. A pause between songs, and I can hear the measured tread of my feet on the road, then a song again, then silence again and the tread of my footsteps. It's good.

He continues: "When I was young, something always used to sing inside me, or often did, without any women's songs." On such occasions,

as again when watching a fine sunset three years later, he felt that was "an everlasting world which is joyful", and that human beings were upon to augment its joy and beauty. And his spiritual *malaise* turned to a frenzy of the aggravations of family life, that vision came back to him. There had been a brief period when he and Sonya were reconciled by the devastating loss of their little son, Ivan. Tolstoy saw in it "a manifestation of God, a drawing of me towards life". It would appear to be one of the few moments perhaps the only one, in which he felt God, but more than abstract "law and might". Sonya had shown him this, and it led to a decision one would never have expected from the Tolstoy the world knows: "Yes, one must always live as though a favourite child is dying in a room nearby. He is always dying. And I am always dying . . .".

Rediscovering a repertoire

A. G. Cross

SIMON KARLINSKY
Russian Drama from its Beginnings to the Age of Pushkin
357pp. University of California Press. £35.50.
0520052374

The path out of the *Sexual Labyrinth* of Nikolai Gogol down into the catacombs of pre-Gogolian Russian drama is not as easy one to follow, but Simon Karinsky believed in his earlier work that he had grasped the necessary Ariadne's thread. In the envoi to *Russian Drama from its Beginnings to the Age of Pushkin*, the path now clearly beaten, Professor Karinsky leaves us with Gogol's *Inspector General* (1836), the play that "casts a long, lingering look of farewell at the theater of Fonvizin, Kapnist, and Shakhovskoy and then sets off, full sail, for the new shores of nineteenth- and twentieth-century drama, where Russian playwrights would become an integral part of the International theatrical world". Karinsky's own backward glance penetrates much further than the preceding reigns of Catherine II and Alexander I, who the Fonvizina and Shakhovskoy were active, and encompasses centuries when Russia's relationship with the West in things theatrical, as in so many other spheres, was that of apprentice and imitator rather than of partner and contributor. National pride and native originality fought the irresistible urge to imitate, but the Russians remained "Scythians in Paris-cut coats", as John Murray remarked to George Borrow in 1841, a view apparently shared by Karinsky's contemporary interlocutors, but contested with typical verve and no little success by the author.

It was in the reign of Peter the Great's father, the worthy Alexei, whom modern scholarship increasingly identifies with Russia's positive but more moderate moves towards the West, that the secular theatre was born, and the first literary - ie, scripted - drama, the real subject of Karinsky's investigation, were produced. In October 17, 1672, when the Tsar sat for ten hours, seemingly entranced, through the first performance of *The Comedy of Araxes*, written by J. G. Gregori, a Lutheran pastor in Moscow, is a significant date in the history of the theatre in Russia. It is the Russian plays, *Nebuchadnezzar* and *The Prodigal Son*, written by Simeon of Polotsk shortly afterwards, that stand at the head of the native tradition. Rightly disputing the claims for *Araxes* to be considered the first Russian play, Karinsky gives to Simeon "the incontestable honor of being the first modern Russian poet and the first Russian literary playwright".

The recent appearance of a Soviet five-volume collection of Russian plays written from the time of Simeon up to the introduction of Neoclassicism in the 1740s has enabled Karinsky to survey comparatively not only the religious dramas of Simeon's followers, notably Dmitry of Rostov and Feofan Prokhorovich, but also the anonymous dramatization of the legendary adventures of the hero of the Russian epic, the *Bylina*, and in many

script and providing subjects for popular prints. He finds qualities in some of the dramatic revivals "amusing and enjoyable", which is certainly not willing to concede to any of the tragedies or many of the comedies that appeared in the second half of the eighteenth century in the unmistakably Paris-cut coat of Neoclassicism. Curiously enough, it was Neoclassical tragedy by the "Russian Racine", Alexander Sumarokov, that was the first Russian play to be translated into English in 1806; an English reviewer, writing in a kind, proposed a series of structural and other changes that would have brought the play closer to the "unenlightened" Shakespeare whom Sumarokov had originally combined and emasculated.

Russian Neoclassical tragedy, as exemplified in the work of Sumarokov or of his successors Kheraskov, Nikoiev and Kalashnikov, is a curious thing. Karinsky, who was nevertheless manages to discover the occasional nugget amid the fool's gold promoted by some Soviet critics and the general dross of Neoclassical comedies, in prose and verse, comic opera, as, bourgeois and lachrymose comedies, and dramas that the last decades of the eighteenth century accumulated. He willingly joins the chorus of acclaim for Denis Fonvizin's *The Minor*, "the best Russian play of the eighteenth century", which alone has remained in the repertoire from its first performance in September 1782 to the present day, but he also finds much to commend to Vladimir Lashin's *The Wastrel Reformed by Love* (1765), Bogdan Elchaninov's one-act comedy *The Olden Undone* (1767), where suddenly "the Russian language was shown to be capable of gaiety and ready for *marivaudage*", Yakov Kuchnin's verse comedies *The Braggart* (1786) and *Odd Fellows* (1790) and Pavel Potemkin's effort in a similar genre, *The Triumph of Friendship* (1773). But after *The Minor* is a Vasilii Kapnist's satirical verse comedy about judicial corruption, *Chelme*, first performed in 1798 in the middle of the reign of "Crazy Paul", that stands shoulders above the rest. *Chelme* is one of the few plays Karinsky would wish to see revived, but he will be pleased to know that in fact it has been - in Leningrad in September 1970. The local Leningrad newspaper began to review with the words: "*Chelme*? Kapnist? A dramatist of whom Belinsky said he was already 'completely forgotten', but we must praise the Krásoiarski KomSomo Theatre for its success in 'shaking the academic dust' from a worthwhile and entertaining comedy".

Professor Karinsky has himself meticulously shaken the dust from a whole library of little-known and less read plays; and this is especially the case when he moves into the first decades of the nineteenth century, treating with sympathy the briefly reviving fortunes of Neoclassical tragedy, with the admittance of sentimentalism and Ossianic ecstasies brought in by Vladimir Ozerov, and the witty and satirical comedies and vaudevilles of Alexander Shakhovskoy and Nikolai Khrushchinskii, book ends with chapters on Griboedov and Pushkin, and a convincing demonstration of the links with the dramatic tradition of the eighteenth century.

Dogged prosecution

Julie Neville

JOHN BRYSON
Evil Angels: The death of Azaria Chamberlain in the central Australian desert, and the events leading to judgement
350pp. Viking. £12.95.
0670809934

Some crimes are instantly elevated to the status of myth because they touch a nerve deep in the national underbelly. The Azaria Chamberlain case is one such. Five years ago, Azaria, a nine-week-old baby, was reported stolen by a dingo in the Northern Territory of Australia, but after an extraordinary series of trials, the baby's mother was convicted of its murder. But it has just been announced, too late, alas, for inclusion in this book, that Mrs Chamberlain, who has been serving a life sentence with hard labour, has been released from prison because of the discovery "of startling new evidence".

The central emblem of the affair is the dingo, the native dog, representative of all that is misunderstood, beleaguered and some say rather noble in the Australian character; the dingo that Australians need to believe in, epitomized by Ned Kelly. The dingo was named by Mrs Chamberlain for making off with her baby from their tent while they were on a camping holiday in the desert. This was no ordinary desert, but in the very heart of the Australian darkness, under the Aboriginal sacred site of Ayers Rock. From John Bryson's account in *Evil Angels* it would appear that, in the main, the Australian public was biased against the Chamberlains. They were Seventy-day Adventists: indeed Mr Chamberlain was a pastor in the faith. There is a rooted distrust of "wossers" (Australian for Fundamentalist Christians), based on the conviction that all that grim (or too sweet) piety must be hypocritical. Moreover, Mrs Chamberlain is exceedingly pretty in an old-fashioned way. Demurely tantalizing, chillingly neat, she appeared in court in flowery dresses, immaculately starched. "I'd like to rumple up all that ironing", commented one typical male spectator at her trial.

Much of the evidence, both for the prosecution and for the defence, hinged on the opinions of forensic scientists, who at the outset were treated as ultimate authorities, but by the end were seen to be as fallible as the rest of us. The media played a sulphurous role. For exam-

ple, it was widely reported that the baby's name, Azaria, meant "sacrifice in the desert". It does not. But by the time the correction was publicized, the falsehood was generally believed.

The length and portentousness of *Evil Angels* are indications of the obsessional hold the case has on Australians, not least the author. According to the blurb the book has "occupied him day and night for the past four years". Bryson, with both a legal and a literary background, is well qualified to make what amounts to a plea for Mr and Mrs Chamberlain, but while the book is certainly a "vivid documentary" it is by no means "a major literary achievement". What it provides is a thorough (sometimes slightly tedious) analysis of the background and events of the case; but it conveys, too, a very real sense of some haunting enigmas at the heart of it all, and it does so with touches of artistry.

There are many worrying anomalies. Someone broke into the Chamberlains' car while it was still in the police compound and left a syringe behind. After the initial discovery of the baby's clothes, they were moved to a different spot and neatly folded. The evidence of a reliable defence witness, another camper, was discounted at the trial, although she said she had distinctly heard the baby crying in the Chamberlains' tent at a time long after the prosecution claimed it had been killed in their car. Speculation about Azaria's death has been endless. It was thought that it might have been caused by one of her brothers (sibling rivalry being the great untold crime). Or perhaps Mrs Chamberlain, in a fit of post-natal depression, really did stab the baby in the car with the scissors (her husband then helping her to cover

up and invent the dingo story). But, if so, why did they then go off to buy souvenirs, then pose for slushy home-movies? In the end the story, if not the baby, has been worried to death.

Mrs Chamberlain lost much of her stretched glory in the court proceedings. If she had confessed and pleaded guilty, she would not have been sentenced to more than two years imprisonment. To Australia, infanticide is often not punished with a gaol sentence at all. If she was indeed guilty, one cannot help feeling that she was anyway punished enough by the trial, a trial and appeal, during which she had to endure, day after day, descriptions by an "expert" such as the following: "Can you imagine a situation where the dingo was able to fasten its teeth on the child's face and carry it off?" "I wouldn't be able to. The facial tissues would be ripped away." On and on it goes, rivulets of blood, sprays of blood, and ostensible reasons why there were no saliva stains or dog hairs left on the pathetic little jump-suit.

Evil Angels leaves the reader uncertain about whether Mrs Chamberlain is guilty, but full of admiration for her courage. Her husband, needless to say, lost his faith; one of her small sons was subsequently blinded in one eye in an accident at a party. But, apparently, she remains unbroken. After giving birth in prison to another baby (which was taken from her) she named it Kahila. "Let them try to make something of that", she said.

Evil Angels would undoubtedly have much helped the committee which was campaigning to have her released from prison. The most interesting book on the subject, though, would concentrate on why so many ghouls wanted - no, needed - to believe in the Chamberlains' guilt.



An early Australian settler's hut.

From the concubine class

Geoffrey Blainey

PORTIA ROBINSON
The Hatch and Brood of Time: A study of the first generation of native-born white Australians 1788-1828
Volume One
369pp. Oxford University Press. £30.
0195544569

It is not easy for a nation born as a convict settlement to come to terms with its birth. Many Australian families soon took pains to forget their convict ancestry, and the sneaking fear that the descendants of convicts might be inferior in physique and spirit made a cricket victory against England all the more satisfying in the 1870s. Two generations later, C.E.W. Bean, writing the story of Australia in the First World War, virtually swept aside the convict past, and in one forgetful but memorable passage he referred to Australia's history between 1788 and 1914 as "126 years of freedom". Meanwhile a few other historians shook hands with the convict founders by depicting them as village Hampdens, handkerchief thieves, merry patchers hankering after rabbit stew, or the victims of harsh English laws and oppressive economic conditions.

The tide of revisionism had now gone out too far. In the mid-1950s Manning Clark challenged these national and romantic stereotypes, and in 1965 Lloyd Robson went further with a statistical survey that gave no place to the romantic. A decade later the first

feminist historians moved in and squashed what little romance remained by decreeing that Sydney was abominable in its treatment of women. *The Hatch and Brood of Time* indicates that the return tide has reached high-water mark and is now likely to ebb.

Portia Robinson studies the white children born in early New South Wales and also looks closely at the parents, so many of whom were convicts. The colonial-born children multiplied quickly and by 1812 one quarter of the New South Wales population was under the age of twelve. Their increase was aided by the fact that infectious diseases were less prevalent in Australia. Moreover, we learn that infanticide was relatively uncommon, largely because child-bearing gave a convict woman "a reduction in hours of work and an increase in indulgences".

Irrespective of whether parents were married, family life was stronger than English observers realized, and indeed the colonial women were more sober and law-abiding than was suggested by the pioneering feminist historians of the 1970s, Anne Summers and Miriam Dixon. For such a misunderstanding, Dr Robinson partly blames Chaplain Samuel Marsden, whose "Female Register" of 1806 had crudely sorted the 1,430 women of New South Wales into two categories consisting of 1,035 concubines and 395 married women. An Irish girl who refused to be married in the Church of England was classed by Marsden as a concubine. Various widows, as well as those married women who were joined by a common-law marriage, were also classed as concubines. Generally, the colony's officials

and those who wrote from the remoteness of England assumed that the first generation of mothers, "tainted with the accepted image of whoredom and prostitution", must have constantly exposed their children to vice; but Robinson's conclusion is very different.

The book illuminates many sides of early colonial life: the rarity of child labour by English standards, the eagerness of the convicts' children to take up trades as well as land, and the preference of colonial-born women for bridegrooms who were likely to prosper rather than those whose background was respectable. She explains that the colonial-born ladies shunned the opportunities at sea; in their eyes the harsh treatment of free sailors was reminiscent of the treatment of convicts.

Her book is based on heavy research, more of which will surface when the second volume, consisting of documentary evidence, is published. This volume alone devotes eighty-five pages to end-notes, sources and four indexes, none of which includes the important Samuel Marsden: a single consolidated index might have been more helpful. Dr Robinson's success comes from sensible weighing and measuring but occasionally she seems unfair when discussing the opinions of observers from the Georgian era or modern historians. Thus her emphasis on the importance of the single man, proclaimed as "unrecognized until now", is found annually in undergraduate essays, where it was implanted by earlier historians. And yet, all in all, her work stands out not only for imaginative investigation but also for common sense in selecting explanations which others overlooked.

NEW GRAFTON BOOKS

FRANZ LISZT:
THE MAN
AND THE MUSICIAN
Ronald Taylor

With excellent biographies of Wagner and Schumann to his credit, Ronald Taylor now turns his attention to 'the most famous personality in the whole of Europe', as Liszt was described in his lifetime. In an absorbing, impressive biography he explores the contradictions in Liszt's character, discusses his music as the creative expression of his intellectual and spiritual energy, and offers moving insights into the life of this great musician.

0246 171155 ILLUSTRATED £15.00

LORENZO DA PONTE
Sheila Hodges

'As well as filling in the background, and assiduously unearthing a lot of new material, she has taken a critical look at Da Ponte's voluminous *Memoirs* and come up with an immensely readable account of a man who might have stepped from one of his own librettos. A my life, appealing to all readers of biography. The publishers have done their outpour, and her subject, proud with a handsome volume at a very reasonable price.'

COUNTRY LIFE
0246 120010 ILLUSTRATED £12.95

TURNER: THE MAN
AND HIS ART
Jack Lindsay

Turner's distinguished biographer Jack Lindsay has written this invaluable introduction to Turner's life and work to celebrate the opening next year of the Clive Gallery at the Tate which will fulfil Turner's will and provide a permanent home for the priceless collection of paintings and watercolours he left to the nation.

The book traces the development of Turner's prodigious creativity and will deepen every reader's appreciation of him as a man and as an artist.

0246 119929 ILLUSTRATED £10.95
0246 170753 ILLUSTRATED £7.95 PA

WOMEN ARE BLOODY
MARVELOUS!
Betty Burton

Betty Burton won the Obichater Festival Award for her play *Women are Bloody Marvellous!*, which forms the basis of the title story in this brilliant collection. For wit, compassion and scope shine through such stories as 'The Ice Bear' and 'The Melon-Seed Girl' - both set in Johannesburg - and 'The Native Air', where her sense and sensibility about women and their liberation from even the loosest of shackles are seen to excellent effect.

Betty Burton's first novel, *Jude*, will be published by Grafton Books later this year.
0246 128003 £5.95

GRAFTON BOOKS
A Division of the Collins Publishing Group

Measuring the meritocracy

Adrian Wooldridge

RAYMOND E. FANCHER
The Intelligence Men: Makers of the IQ
controversy
269pp. Norton. £14.95.
0393019829
VICTOR SEREBRIAKOFF
Mensa: The society for the highly intelligent
317pp. Constable. £9.95.
0094660409

Intelligence testers have provoked more public hostility than almost any other group of experts. Radicals have presented them as cynical or deluded defenders of the established order; educationalists have accused them of shoring up a discredited system of school selection; and psychologists have suggested that they sacrificed their understanding of child development to their passion for measurement and classification. When Arthur Jensen, Hans Eysenck and Richard Herrnstein tried to revitalize intelligence testing in the late 1960s, academic criticism gave way to political hysteria. In Berkeley, Jensen was vilified in public demonstrations and threatened with death; in Harvard, Herrnstein was noisily accused of "misusing science" in support of "racial superiority, male supremacy and unemployment"; and in London, Eysenck was assaulted during a public lecture. In *The Intelligence Men: Makers of the IQ controversy* Raymond Fancher provides a highly readable account of the origins of this deplorable outbreak of radical bigotry.

Intelligence testing owed its inspiration to Charles Darwin's half-cousin, Sir Francis Galton. Repelled by popular "pretensions of natural equality", Galton argued that men differ widely in their natural abilities; that "characteristics cling to families" and "ability goes by descent"; and that ability is in principle capable of precise and objective measurement. He spent much of his life in an unsuccessful search for a valid test of ability.

His problem was finally solved by a Frenchman, Alfred Binet. Commissioned by the Minister of Public Education to pick out children with basic learning difficulties, he assigned an age level to a variety of simple intellectual operations, determined by the earliest age at which the average child could complete the task, and then ranked his subjects against their peers. His distinction between

mental age and chronological age resulted in a precise grading of the differences between children, providing an easily intelligible measure of the severity of mental defect, while his use of a sequence of age-related tests made it possible to gauge the unfolding of mental abilities. William Stern soon afterwards invented the notion of IQ by the simple arithmetical device of dividing mental age by chronological age and multiplying by 100, leaving a single number which was taken as an index of a child's ability. Binet had always been sceptical of Galton's hereditary thinking, denouncing its "brutal pessimism", and designed a system of "mental orthopaedics" to improve the abilities of the retarded. Yet his tests were rapidly used to support Galtonian psychology. Charles Spearman, an English soldier turned scientist, set about placing Galton's arguments on a more rigorous statistical foundation. Brooding on the results of a number of tests, he came to the conclusion that all mental acts involve the use of two distinct types of ability: a "general ability" or "g", which was the same for every mental act, and a "specific ability" or "s", which reflected particular skills and was related to the type of act performed. "G" was naturally the more interesting quality for any mental test: the mere a test measured "g" and eliminated "s" the more it would reveal an individual's inherited abilities. By 1912 he was enthusing about the minimum amount of intelligence necessary to qualify "for parliamentary vote, and above all, for the right to have offspring".

Equipped with Binet's tests and Spearman's theories, this technique spread rapidly throughout the world, finding a particularly receptive audience in the United States. Lewis Terman standardized the tests for American schoolchildren and collected an enormous body of evidence about the gifted; Henry Goddard measured the abilities of the dull, using his results to argue for their segregation and sterilization; Robert Yerkes tested some 1,750,000 recruits to the army during the First World War; and David Wechsler developed a technique for measuring the intelligence of adults.

The most controversial question raised by testing was that of the relative roles played by hereditary and environmental factors in determining IQ scores. Galton had suggested that identical twins separated at birth might provide the solution to the problem, and several psychologists throughout the world began to look for twins. Sir Cyril Burt claimed by far the

largest and most perfect sample, using it to support his conviction that general intelligence was inherited rather than acquired. At the same time he developed a thoroughgoing biological interpretation of social stratification, arguing that, since inherited intelligence was the main determinant of an individual's social position, egalitarian social reform would inevitably fall foul of the facts of biology.

Burt's work came into renewed international prominence in 1969 when Jensen used it to support his claim that the fifteen-point difference between the IQ scores of whites and blacks in America might be open to a genetic explanation. Intended to undermine the main arguments for compensatory education, Jensen's claim naturally aroused a vast outpouring of demolitions and denunciations. In particular, Leon Kamin produced a withering review of the intelligence testing tradition, dismissing Burt's twins as figments of his imagination, emphasizing the connections between the early testing movement and eugenics and racial bigotry, and arguing for an environmentalist interpretation of group differences. His claim echoed John Stuart Mill's contention that "of all vulgar modes of escaping from the consideration of the social and moral influences on the human mind, the most vulgar is that attributing the diversities of human conduct and character to inherent original natural differences".

Fancher reconstructs this complicated story through a series of intellectual biographies, emphasizing the influence of personal experience on intellectual commitments. He also provides a useful summary of the arguments advanced by both sides, leaving the reader to make up his mind on their merits. His book is not a work of detailed research or sophisticated historical interpretation: anyone seriously interested in the subject should turn to Gillian Sutherland's *Ability, Merit and Measurement: Mental testing and English education 1880-1940* and Daniel J. Keefe's *In the Name of Eugenics: Genetics and the uses of human heredity*. But, within its self-imposed limits, it is readable, balanced and well constructed, examining the problem with clarity and eschewing the vulgar slogans which have so distorted the historiography of the subject.

One of the most dubious products of the intelligence testing movement was Mensa, the self-styled "society for the highly intelligent". Victor Serebriakoff writes with an insider's authenticity on the subject - he is now Honorary

President of International Mensa - and his book confirms what many have long suspected: that high intelligence bears little relation to such humdrum virtues as modesty, common sense, or organizational ability.

In its early days the Society was dominated by a bearded Australian, Roland Berrill. Turned down for a place at Balliol, Berrill tried to establish himself in university circles by acting as an uninvited rowing coach to the Balliol crew, running along the towpath yelling less than welcome exhortations and advice. He then bit on the mere imaginative idea of creating a "high IQ club", financed and controlled by himself. Convinced that the club would carry influence in government circles, he used it as a vehicle for his eccentric ideas about astrology, phrenology, and radical dress reform. He appointed a woman to act as the "focus of loyalty" to Mensa, selecting her solely on the basis of "pulsbrutality" and helping her to don her splendid robes. She presided at Mensa dinners, sitting on a vast zebra-skin throne as the assembled aristocrats of the intellect discussed astrology, women's clothes and dianetics.

Berrill's departure from the scene did not put an end to Mensa's eccentricities. Serebriakoff recalls that his attempt to revitalize the organization was hampered by a lunatic fringe of "litigious men of straw". Motivated by "persecution mania" and "underachievement envy", these "misfits" and "loudmouths" mounted an unscrupulous campaign to take over the leadership of the society. They filed endless legal suits against the council, threatened Mensa employees with violence, announced the imminent death of their opponents, and sent innumerable poison-pen letters, hinting, for example, that Serebriakoff's son (a policeman) was a juvenile delinquent and that his daughter (a fifteen-year-old schoolgirl) had had two abortions.

What sort of people would want to join such a society? Serebriakoff's book suggests that many members are motivated by an unpalatable mixture of arrogance and idealism. It looks forward, for example, to a day when Mensa, will make contact with intelligences on other planets. At the moment he is much exercised by the problem of whether to admit intelligent machines to the organization.

Despite its inelegance of style and incoherence of tone, Serebriakoff's book will be read by all connoisseurs of the cranky and cantankerous.

Nasser and after

P. J. Vatikiotis

TAWEFQ AL HAKIM
The Return of Consciousness
Translated by Bayly Winder
296pp. Macmillan. £22.50.
0333566700

KAPHAEL ISRAELI
Man of Defiance: A political biography of
Anwar Sadat
314pp. Weidenfeld and Nicolson. £18.95.
029778532X

GILLES KEPEL
The Prophet and Pharaoh: Muslim extremism
in Egypt
266pp. Al Saqi Books; distributed by Zed
Books. £18 (paperback, £5.95).
0863561187

In the winter of 1972-3, while I was working on my book *Nasser and his Generation*, I visited Tawfiq al Hakim, the doyen of Egyptian letters, in his office in the Aham Building in Cairo at least three times a week for several weeks, to discuss with him, and with others who would drop in, a variety of matters. Egyptians were not too happy at that time. Barely a year after Nasser's death a fierce power struggle broke out between his successor, Sadat, and some of his courtiers. There was a stalemate in the confrontation with the Israelis, who were still occupying Sinai and the East Bank of the Suez Canal. The country's economy was in great difficulty under the burden of enormous military expenditure. There was confusion and apprehension over the new President's intentions and policies, and 1973 was a year of widespread unrest.

The morale of all my friends - university teachers, writers and journalists - was shattered. The blind Sheikh al Imam's satirical songs were listened to avidly by everyone. The writer Yusuf Idris had just published in November 1972 his brilliant allegorical piece in the *Ahram*, "Ana Sultan... Qanun al-wujud" (I am Sultan [the Ilen]... Law of Being), about the lion who had mauled to death its tamer, el Helou, on the opening night of the circus.

Before I left Egypt, al Hakim handed me the typescript of a critique of the Nasser régime entitled "The Return of Consciousness", dated July 23, 1972, saying "Publish it under my name, anywhere." By the time I began writing my own book, al Hakim's tract had been published in Beirut (1974), and there was an immediate outcry and a cacophony of vituperation and vilification of its author. A year earlier, Ahmad Hussein's *Kanfa' tarafat Abdel Nasser wa 'shita ayama hukmhi* (How I came to know Abdel Nasser and lived the days of his rule), highly critical of the régime, was published in Beirut. Hussein had been the founder and leader of the Young Egypt Society (*Mak el Fann*) back in 1933, a radical rightist youth organization which Nasser joined in 1934-5. Louis Awad's equally critical *Aqni'at al-nasir* (The Seven Masks of Nasserism) appeared two years later in 1975.

The books by al Hakim and Hussein were by no means the first public critiques of Nasser and Nasserism. Earlier onslaughts were launched by, among others, the Muslim Brethren. (After a brief period of co-operation, the Muslim Brethren had fallen out with the régime of Free Officers over policy matters. When a Muslim Brother tried to assassinate Nasser in Alexandria in July 1954, the Brethren organization was proscribed, its property and other assets confiscated, several of its leaders executed, and scores of its members imprisoned.) One such critique was *Al-maqadima al-shariyya fi qanun al-nasir* (Underground resistance in the Suez Canal) by Kamal al-Sharif, first published in 1954 and reprinted in 1957. The prominent journalist Ahmad al-Fatih, co-publisher with his brother, Mahmud, of the leading Watfist daily *al-Masri*, and a close confidant of Nasser from 1950 and 1954, published his scathing attack on Nasser, *L'affaire Nasser*, in Paris in 1962. Yusuf Idris's play *al-Rafiq* (The Friend) was published and first performed to packed audiences in Cairo in 1963. Although not a direct attack on Nasserism, the play was a denunciation of "the system". In the after-

math Nasser changed the organization's leading from the Saudi King Feisal who launched an Islamic Bloc to combat Nasserism. Nevertheless, al Hakim's tract sat his repudiating seal on Nasserism and its corollaries of Pan-Arabism and Arab Socialism in Egypt. That the well-known Westernized liberal playwright and essayist of the inter-war and post-war period should denounce Nasser's failed experiment was not surprising. After all, al Hakim had identified himself with a strictly secular territorial Egyptian nationalism and national identity, unencumbered by the religious overtones of Islam, since the 1930s. One of his earliest plays, *Ahl al-kalf* (People of the Cave, 1933), and his novel *Awdat al-rah* (Return of the Spirit), celebrating the 1919 revolt against Britain, attest to that. Nor was it surprising that he should write his tract and date it July 1972 to coincide with the shift in Sadat's policy orientation (the purging of Nasser's power cliques in 1971 and the dismissal of Soviet personnel from Egypt in 1972). It was clearly a deliberate and calculated inauguration of a national debate by al Hakim, who deplored Egypt's involvement with the Arab states as harmful and counterproductive, rejected the wider pretensions of an Arab and Islamic identity as unnecessary and superfluous, and boldly defended a secular Egyptian national identity. In order to render his initiation of the new debate plausible, let alone credible, al Hakim had somehow to explain his own participation, if only by omission and silence, in the "pharaonic" régime of the Free Officers, as well as the acquiescence in it of his fellow-intellectuals, who should have known better. Hence his excuse: "the loss of consciousness" in having followed blindly a prime demagogue. Nasserism, in other words, was the responsibility of both Nasser and people like al Hakim.

Nasserism, according to al Hakim, meant the destruction of the fledgling liberal-secular elite during the inter-war period - admittedly a certain consistency in his thought as this is expressed and reflected in his writings.

ideologue, Sayyid Qutb, and on the heels of the shattering June 1967 defeat, demonstrating and rioting students in February and November 1968 publicly attacked Nasserism. A little-known publication by a Muslim Brethren sympathizer, Galal Kishk, *Madha yuridu al-ahlab al-misriyyun* (What do the Egyptian students want) was published that year. Outside Egypt, Nasser and Nasserism were repudiated categorically when the United Arab Republic, the organic union between Egypt and Syria (1958-61), was broken up by a Syrian army coup d'état on September 28, 1961. Egyptian military involvement in the Yemen (1962-7) attracted further and wider attacks on Nasserism, the most prominent among these coming

ism", as well as abject defeat in war. "Bravado was the nature of Abdel Nasser", avers al Hakim, and his policy was one of "lies and delusions". Nasser's leadership - a dictatorial system of absolute presidency - "ruined Egypt and brought tragedy to the Arabs". Al Hakim likens Nasserism to Fascism and Hitlerism: "the elimination of minds and wills other than the mind and will of the leader". "The meaning of referendum", al Hakim writes,

when all the papers thump for the word "yes" in heavy red type and where the result comes out as 99.9% in favour, is that the country has no consciousness, no freedom, and finally no human dignity.

Perhaps one reason why not even al Hakim dared write his tract while Nasser was alive and



President Sadat praying for a successful outcome of the Camp David talks.

in power is suggested by Naguib Mahfuz's novel *al-Karnak* (The Karnak, Beirut 1973), with its depiction of the transformation of thinking men and women into willing minions, purveyors of the ruler's will, and sultan's preachers: intimidation, torture, indignity, atomization. Thus the prominent critic and playwright Louis Awad rejects al Hakim's thesis of "the loss of consciousness" or that of the Egyptian's proclivity to worship the idol-ruler. Rather the failure of the 1952 revolution, according to Awad, was due to Nasser's closed political system, his autocracy that was maintained by a "secret government", and the lack of public accountability or any other basic requirement of democratic rule. "The revolution", Awad insists,

abolished the difference between the state and government... With the defilement of the State the three powers of government - the executive, legislative and judiciary, even the fourth power, that of the press - were fused. They became the four arms of the Leader in whom was the will of the State.

Nasser claimed he had been greatly influenced by al Hakim's writings. He considered the importance of al Hakim's contribution to the nurturing of an Egyptian national - even revolutionary - consciousness sufficient to justify the bestowal of the highest state decoration on the ageing writer. Was al Hakim dishonest and obsequious in accepting the honour? Was he so flattered by the young officers' claim that they were fulfilling the prophecy of his earlier writings about a "blessed revolution"? Probably there was an element of vanity that succumbed to flattery, combined with a measure of genuine belief (not for too long, however) in the good intentions and capabilities of the Free Officers. Whatever the reasons or the motives, al Hakim too became a minion, a *rafiq*, or *friend* in native parlance, and hence his decision to make a public apology for his moral lapse - even a public confession and repentance - with *The Return of Consciousness*.

It would be unfair, though, to deny al Hakim a certain consistency in his thought as this is expressed and reflected in his writings.

Although highly critical of the Egyptian parliamentary system of the inter-war period, he equally rejected other systems of the time, Fascist or Communist. His fantasizing about a Great Leader verged on the Platonic if not the utopian. But he also held that a West European system of law and government was ill-suited to Egypt. That was the thrust of his delightful *Yawmiyyat na'ib fi'l-aryaf* (The Diary of a Country Prosecutor: English translation by Aubrey S. Eban as *The Maze of Justice*, Harvill Press, 1947) which, incidentally, the translator of *The Return of Consciousness* never mentions in his introduction. (Nor is his translation of al Hakim's text always felicitous, as it tends towards the literal.)

Only al Hakim could have written such a tract. In fact, it was somehow expected of him, not only as expiation of the intellectuals' sin of silence during a despotic régime and acquiescence in its excesses, but also as a signal for the resurrection of Egyptian secular liberalism and Egyptian territorial nationalism in the face of the onslaught from the extremist Muslim traditional restorative and radical populist movements.

Among al Hakim's critics and detractors, those who promote the radical or extremist Islamic cause in Egypt consider him an infidel secularist. Thus the public debates, following the conclusion of the peace treaty with Israel in 1979, in which al Hakim and Louis Awad on one side defended vigorously the idea of a secular Egyptian nationalism independent of Islam and Arabism against their Arab nationalist and Islamic fundamentalist interlocutors on the other, were published in Cairo in 1981 under the title *Al-in'izham fi'nasr* (The Isolationists in Egypt). Together with *The Return of Consciousness* these are an indication of the polarization that marks any discussion of the National Question in Egypt, which discussion was actually initiated nearly eighty years ago. Al Hakim's tract is not simply, as the translator states in his introduction, "the intellectual forerunner of Sadatism". Rather it is a restatement, if not a reformulation, of an earlier thesis and position regarding the National Question in an old debate.

However hard, therefore, Raphael Israeli tries in his *Man of Defiance* to project Sadat as the successor to Nasserism, it is ludicrous to base it on the notion that Sadat believed he was the "father" of the Egyptians, or on his perception of Egypt as a big "village" with himself as its "omda". Sadatism as a successor to Nasserism makes sense only in terms of the concentration and personification of power; that is, in terms of a hegemonic ruler. Sadat was very much the product of the same turbulent Egyptian urban political crucible of the early 1930s as Nasser; only Sadat was more restless, reckless and adventurous, and his involvement in the extra-parliamentary conspiratorial and violent youth politics of the country long antedated that of Nasser. He suffered persecution, privation, imprisonment and cashiering from the army officer corps, whereas neither Nasser nor any of the other original members of the Free Officer conspiracy did. To this extent he was a rebel long before any of the others had turned revolutionary. Yet, in sharing with Nasser the same experience of politicization in the 1930s, Sadat became, like Nasser, a hegemonist who believed he personified Egypt's national destiny.

Equally conservative in values and perceptions, Sadat was at least on the surface a more devout Muslim than Nasser and, unlike Nasser, willing to identify with a vague Egyptian peasant ethos and culture. Thus he had, in his turn, to become a *rayes* (the master of a hydraulic society), a chief of men. He had the benefit of the experience of a man on the run from authority, as well as of an unfulfilled revolutionary promise under Nasser. This enabled him to arrest the "march of Egypt's folly" in persisting with a permanent war against Israel and a costly leadership of the Arab world. The October 1973 war cost Egypt ten million dollars an hour. By then, Egyptians had realized that their dispute with Israel was basically a territorial one (over Sinai), that their leadership of the Arab cause was making them miss "the economic bus" of the century, as well as lose their instinctive, millennia-old secular approach to life for survival.

These are the important ingredients of the Free Officer saga which Dr Israeli, with his

Civilization's discontents

Anthony Clare

RICHARD WARNER
Recovery from Schizophrenia: Psychiatry and
political economy
380pp. Routledge and Kegan Paul. £25.
0710099797

Schizophrenia is a severe mental disorder in which the afflicted person's ability to recognize reality and his or her emotional responses, thinking processes, judgment and ability are so affected as seriously to impair general functioning. It affects approximately one person in a hundred, most commonly strikes during late adolescence, and, in the Western world, appears to have a somewhat grim prognosis. Despite the development during the post-war years of potent anti-psychotic drugs, there has been no significant change in the course and outcome of the condition since it was first described in a systematic way by Emil Kraepelin almost exactly a century ago. Complete recovery occurs in less than 20 per cent of patients while about 50 per cent of those who experience an insidious onset never fully recover and remain quite seriously impaired.

All of this and a great deal more form the constituent elements of this substantial book by a British-born and trained psychiatrist currently working as director of a mental health centre in Colorado. Indeed, the book is useful as an up-to-date review of the biological, genetic and psychological factors which appear to determine the distribution and the course of schizophrenia and the organic disturbances thought to underpin the syndrome. But Richard Warner is not merely summarizing

available data and knowledge. He is propounding a thesis which, given its social and political emphases, is somewhat at odds with the physical emphases which currently dominate psychiatric research and thinking, particularly in North America.

Warner is puzzled by the finding, first reported by the World Health Organization's International Pilot Study of Schizophrenia, that the outcome of schizophrenia is actually better in Third World countries than in modern, industrialized societies. He explores the potential role of stigma, unemployment, community support and social integration as well as more orthodox factors such as treatment facilities and the impact of drugs, and he concludes that whereas material conditions do not create schizophrenia (they do mould the course and outcome of the illness and, along with other factors, influence its prevalence).

He contrasts the reabsorption of schizophrenic patients within society in the developing world with what passes for community care in North America, Britain and Western Europe. As a recent and impressive series of articles on the subject in *The Times* powerfully revealed, the run-down of the large, isolated mental hospitals and the dispersal of substantial numbers of treated and half-treated psychotic patients into society has not been an unqualified success. The community facilities, the half-way homes and hostels, the sheltered workshops, the day hospitals and centres, have not been developed to the level necessary to ensure proper treatment and rehabilitation for many of these patients. The result has been that an unknown but suspiciously high number are left to live socially deprived and isolated lives in boarding houses, reception centres, probation

Skid Row. Despite the greater involvement of the community there is still precious little evidence that mental illness has lost much of the stigma that has affected those who suffer from it and those who struggle to treat them. The result is that schizophrenia is a poorly studied disease, resources for the treatment and rehabilitation of schizophrenics are, with a few notable exceptions, inadequate, and they and their families remain relatively estranged from society. The impact of rising unemployment has been such as to make the whole dismal situation even worse.

It has been known for many years that the condition seems to cluster in the lower social classes and that inner-city populations have significantly higher prevalence rates. The conventional explanation has been that people with the greatest risk of developing the illness drift into lower-class occupations and low-income city areas as a result of their marginal, pre-psychotic levels of social functioning - the so-called "social drift hypothesis". Warner is not impressed with this explanation. He is impressed, however, by the fact that in the Third World the relationship between class (and caste) and schizophrenia is reversed. In the developing world, it is upper-class, better educated individuals who seem more at risk, but as industrialization increases, this pattern switches around to conform to that found in the West. It is difficult to explain such findings by either the social drift hypothesis or by genetic factors. Warner looks to social and economic factors and the remainder of his book is devoted to evaluating the evidence and sustaining his case.

This is well argued and persuasive, even though Warner seems a little too anxious to

accept other people's hypotheses as fact in so far as they support his own. I am not persuaded, for example, that, here is right in arguing that schizophrenia actually increased with the onset of the Industrial Revolution in Britain and I await with anticipation the outcome of current historical excavations of the seventeenth-century diagnosis and treatment of severe mental disturbance.

But without doubt this is an impressive book and one deserving of a non-professional readership. It contains numerous detailed and weighty tables and disquisitions of the relationship between health, illness and the economy which may overwhelm some lay readers. But at a time when public interest is high, when concern for those who suffer from schizophrenia seems genuine and persistent and when there is much goodwill towards those who treat them, *Recovery from Schizophrenia* provides a most readable and comprehensive account of the present state of knowledge.

Self-Deception and Self-Understanding: New essays in philosophy and psychology, edited by Mika W. Martin (316pp; University Press of Kansas: \$29.95; 0 7006 0264 X), includes Part One, entitled "Defending the self-deception and excuses", an essay on "Collaborative companions: the relationship of self-deception and excuse-making", by C. R. Snydel, while Part Two, "Shaping the self: inner dignity and social coping", includes an examination of "Social psychological strategies of self-deception" by Daniel T. Gilbert and Joel Cooper. Part Three is entitled "Commitment to values: rationally and morally", and Part Four is called "Pursuing paradox and guilty and sleepiness".

oppressively repetitive narrative of minutiae, misses. One could nitpick over errors of fact in the narrative. More important, however, is the author's failure to realize that, like Nasser, Sadat – a key figure in that peculiar generation of politicized young army officers – could not escape the return to the more native (Pharaonic, Mamluk?) idiom of rule. In order to neutralize all opposition and eliminate all traces of his predecessor's persona and legacy, Sadat opened the Pandora's Box of Muslim fundamentalism by encouraging and emphasizing the Islamic basis and dimension of his policy, leading to serious communal trouble, the erosion of national unity and ultimately to his own assassination.

The consequences of Sadat's policy are illuminated by Gilles Kepel's *The Prophet and Pharaoh*. It is an analytical survey of the very organizations and movements Tawfiq al Hakim obhore – for they demand the fusion of sanctity and power, insist on the intimate connection between faith and earthly power, and promote the extra-territorial organic link between Egypt and a wider Arabo-Islamic nation, culture and destiny. They consider all secular rulers as usurpers, since they neither implement God's word nor enforce His revealed sacred law. On the one hand their members shun the sinful – often, ignorant (*jahlīyya*) – society they live in, and on the other they wish to purify it by an apocalyptic act – violent and forceful – of Islamic deliverance. Only in an Islamic state and society, they insist, can a believer lead a truly Muslim life.

The President and the professors

Adam Watson

JIMMY CARTER

The Blood of Abraham: Inside the Middle East 257pp. Sidgwick and Jackson. £13.95.

0283 99261 I

STEVEN L. SPIEGEL

The Other Arab-Israeli Conflict: Making America's Middle East policy, from Truman to Reagan

522pp. University of Chicago Press. £23.75.

0226 76961 S

ALAN DOWDY

Middle East Crisis: U.S. decision-making in 1958, 1970, and 1973

416pp. University of California Press. £38.95.

0520 04809 I

The single-term presidency of Jimmy Carter is generally recognized in the United States as a failure, not least in the Middle East. But the Middle East was also the scene of his outstanding success: he is responsible for the Camp David accords with Israel and Egypt, a unique peace treaty between the two principal combatants which he negotiated personally with Menachem Begin and President Sadat. Carter worked extremely hard on the Middle East during his four years in the White House; informing himself in greater detail than any other president. Hermann Ellis, the United States Ambassador to Saudi Arabia and Egypt, has testified that "the detailed knowledge that President Carter acquired was truly astonishing. So was his sense of balance." Carter has since continued to study the issues involved, by conducting detailed discussions in the Middle East, and by organizing and co-chairing with ex-President Ford a bipartisan "Consultation" at Emory University in Georgia, which was attended by prominent statesmen and scholars from Israel, its Arab neighbours and the Soviet Union. Accounts of these discussions figure prominently in *The Blood of Abraham*.

The problem which Carter addresses in this book is how to convey his diligently acquired understanding to the American public, and particularly to the serious, church-going public outside the sophisticated metropolitan cities. A "born-again" Southern Baptist and Sunday School teacher, he sets his message in a biblical context of scriptural travails. The blood of Abraham flows in the veins of both Jews and Arabs (Carter records that Begin was somewhat disconcerted when Sadat made this point), and the Holy Land is sacred to Christians, Jews and Muslims alike. "Why then," he asks, as so many do in well-attended church

The sole purpose of political activity and the principal function of government, therefore, are to make this possible.

The confrontation between "Pharaoh" (the Egyptian state, governed and supported mainly by a Western-educated élite of professionals, intellectuals, landowners, entrepreneurs, army officers and bureaucrats) and "prophet" (those militant Muslim revisionists who wish to implement God's will on earth) began in earnest in the 1940s. The Society of Muslim Brothers (*Ikhwan*) which was founded by the charismatic schoolmaster Hasan el Banna as a charitable religious organization in Ismailiya in 1928 was by 1947-8 the most serious challenger of state authority and the greatest threat to state security, offering a vision of an alternative socio-political order to that of the secular state. Pre-1952 governments had already mauled it and weakened its leadership and organization (its Supreme Guide, Hasan el Banna, was assassinated by state security agents in February 1949). Nasser subsequently proscribed it and smashed its notorious (paramilitary) "Secret Organization" early on in 1954-5, because it constituted the major challenge to his rule and the most serious threat to his power. Its leading figures languished in prisons and concentration camps, embittered and frustrated with "Pharaoh's" despotic régime.

It is Kepel's contention that from the trials and tribulations of the Brothers emerged the new militant Islamic movement of which the *Ikhwan* was the prototype. More activist and

violent, its ideological base was constructed by Sayyid Qutb. This new ideology simply proclaimed the Egyptian state and society as non or un-Islamic and therefore in need of purification and deliverance. It more or less condemned those who led it as usurpers since their authority was in question: it was not based on proper Islamic precepts. With the earlier mother organization deprived of a charismatic leader and in disarray as a result of repeated blows and persecution by the authorities, new clandestine militant, populist groups emerged to carry on the struggle against the sinful state and order, all of them more or less taking their cue from Qutb's writings. Such are the various Muslim societies which surfaced and made the news headlines either in violent clashes with Copts or the security forces, or with their kidnappings, assassinations and attacks on state installations in the 1970s and 80s.

Kepel's narrative about these groups, their ideological premisses, political connections, organization and activities ranging from the bloody attack on the Military Technical College in 1974, the abduction and murder of a Minister of Waqfs, clashes with the army and police in Middle and Upper Egypt to the assassination of Sadat in October 1981, is the most detailed in English to date. He rightly emphasizes the hostility of these new militant groups to official, traditional, quietist and reformist Islam since, in their view, there can be only one uncompromising, pure and total Islamic society.

In presenting these very important – and

dangerous – splinter militant groups from the mainstream Society of Muslim Brothers movement of twenty-five to thirty years ago, Kepel thinks – erroneously, in my view – that they differ from the original movement in so far as they seek state power through violent action. But the original movement did so too, especially under its founder and Supreme Guide in the 1940s and again later in the early 1950s. I do not think Kepel has done his homework on the earlier Society and its squabbles over the particular issue, for he does not seem to have perused several sets of memoirs that have appeared in the past decade.

On a more important and wider issue Kepel considers Egypt a paradigm for the manifestation of militant Islamic movements. This may be a hasty judgment, the result perhaps of working closely and intensively on these smaller militant groups. The danger is that he minimizes the longevity and resilience of Egypt's state structures and institutions, and among them the army, the bureaucracy and the security services, all of which go back over a hundred years, not to mention the official religious institutions.

That there is a confrontation between Prophet and Pharaoh in Egypt is certainly a very old confrontation. But that a prophet is about to achieve earthly state power is not so certain. Egyptianism (Pharaohism?) will remain pitted against Arabo-Islamism for a long time to come. Even if the prophet attained power he would have to transform himself into pharaoh in order to govern and survive.

After – and before? – the managed economy

Roderick Floud

AUBREY JONES

Britain's Economy: The roots of stagnation 158pp. Cambridge University Press. £17.50.

0521 50816 X

The Westland affair has exposed once again a deep ideological division within the ranks of Conservatives and their natural supporters, industrialists and businessmen. On the one hand, there are the fundamentalists, confident that all will be well if the free market is allowed to operate; on the other, there are the managers, keen to offer and accept government help for commerce and industry and even some mild management of the economy as a whole.

To the fundamentalists, Britain has been on a downward path for years, betrayed first by those who decided business achievements during and after the Industrial Revolution and later by those who pretended that the state could beneficially control and encourage economic growth. They stress long-term cultural weaknesses and a consistent failure to expose British industry to the rigours of open markets. Their remedies are structural and, in this, they have much in common with many sections of the left who stress long-term decline and the need for major change. To the managers, the

failure is more immediate; they are not greatly concerned with Britain's economic history, but with the fact that British governments since the Second World War have not been sufficiently firm or consistent in their macro-economic policies nor interventionist enough in industrial affairs. Like many on the centre or right of the Labour Party, they have faith that good management could still revive the economy.

Aubrey Jones is and always has been a manager. He was one as Minister of Fuel and Power and of Energy between 1955 and 1959, as head of the Prices and Incomes Board from 1964 to 1970 and, since then, as director of Courtaulds, Thomas Tilling and Guest Keen and other leading British companies. He has drawn the scorn of erstwhile colleagues: Enoch Powell, most fundamental of the fundamentalists, once wrote of the Prices and Incomes Board as that "Great Panjandrum whose renegade conservative chief appears to have an insatiable appetite for advising everybody and managing everything".

Autobiography is an unusual form of economic history, but *Britain's Economy* attempts to blend Jones's reflections on the long-term state of the British economy with an account of his own role in shaping it since the Second World War. Inevitably, there is more than a whiff of apologia about the book, but this is redeemed both by Jones's insights into British economic

history and, particularly, by his useful account of his years at the Prices and Incomes Board.

Though a manager, he is not an unquestioning one. He takes seriously the views of those historians who have discerned long-term weaknesses in the economy, whether those weaknesses were the effect of the culture of the gentleman, as advocated by Martin Wiener, or the "institutional sclerosis" discerned by Mancur Olson. Jones accepts that they have a case, buttressed by the obstinate failure of the rate of British economic growth to budge much, or for long, above 2 per cent since the Industrial Revolution or before.

But he remains sceptical of such universal explanations, and rightly so. For it was in the era of the managed economy, in which he took part under both Conservative and Labour governments, that Britain both recovered from the Second World War and achieved growth rates faster than at any other point in her history. Little was heard in the 1950s and 60s about congenial weakness and irremediable decline.

Though the verdict was always "could do better", it is difficult to find any economy of which that was not said. Britain did do better in those years. Whether we did better because of the work of Jones and other managers is more problematical. Most studies of the work of the Prices and Incomes Board have suggested that it had little impact on prices or wages, though it provided a great deal of information about the economy. Nor did Jones's years in charge of energy policy, which coincided with the over-rapid expansion of nuclear power, set us on the right course to achieve a rational mix of energy sources, though he could not of course foresee the difference North Sea oil would make.

What was certainly not achieved was the primary objective of Wilson's technological revolution, in which Jones was a leading agitator, to shift the economy from low-tech to high-tech. As economic historians have increasingly realized, and as Jones stresses in this book, Britain's economy has not been capital-intensive; we have tended to use a lot of labour,

often highly skilled, to produce and sell goods of low unit value, importing high value added goods in return. While this benefited employment, and even led to labour shortages in the 1960s, it left the economy dangerously exposed; with the failure of attempts to change in the 1960s and 70s, only oil saved us. The destruction of all types of manufacturing industry in the last few years has made matters worse, with the expansion of services unlikely to prove a similar saviour.

What remedies does Jones propose? Partly, he wishes to improve British management, of which his years in industry have given him a bad impression; he does not seem to know, however, how this can be done. His strongest prescription, therefore, is concerned with defence expenditure. Increasingly, critics on the left have seen the high proportion of national income devoted to defence as a primary reason for our failure to research and innovate. Jones takes a different view. He proposes to turn our exceptionally high defence expenditure to advantage, by forcing the Ministry of Defence to take a much broader view of its responsibilities, funding basic research as well as weapons development. The nationalized industries, he feels, should do the same, and privatization is likely to prevent this and make matters worse. Last, there should be much more technological collaboration within the EEC.

In all these respects, as he points out, the example of the United States – at least in what it does, rather than in what it says – is encouraging. But, as the Westland affair shows, the managers have simply not convinced the fundamentalists. The chimera of a free market, untrammelled by the state, in defence procurement is still being pursued, while all the other policies which Jones exemplified and still defends are derided from both right and left. His book is, for that reason, a sad and often a depressing one but, given the vicissitudes of British economic policy in the past, his time will probably soon come again.

Gillian Tindall

JEREMY SEABROOK

Landscapes of Poverty

158pp. Oxford: Blackwell. £12.50.

0314 45087

In *Landscapes of Poverty* Jeremy Seabrook has created an impassioned tract in which a metaphor, instead of simply illuminating his subject, becomes 'the dominant motif to which all facts are subordinated. His overt affiliation is Marxist, but it seems to me that his real masters have been the great nineteenth-century virtuosos of peroration, castigation and polemic – Dickens, Kingsley, Carlyle and, most of all, the horde of Nonconformist preachers warning society of the evil of its ways and of the darkness to come. It is almost a relief when, a few pages before the end of what I am tempted to call his "sermon", he alludes directly to one of these models: "we see on a world scale what Thomas Carlyle saw a century and a half ago in Britain". It is the sort of compassion which has some truth but which does not entirely stand up when you come to analyse it. It is also the sort of compassion with which *Landscapes of Poverty* is not only filled but upon which it is predicated.

The book takes the form of an interplay between the literal landscapes of poverty, housing estates of our own society or the mills and slum towns of India, and the mental landscapes of those trapped in poverty. In this the metaphor is elaborately worked out: it compares the physical dislocation and degradation of the early nineteenth-century farm workers, huddled in the new industrial towns, with present-day consumerism allied to the traumas of de-industrialization and unemployment.

This time, it has been only the psychiatric structures that have been broken and reassembled. It is the literal landscape that have borne the scars – a breaking of relationships, a destruction of associations, with their accompanying absence and loneliness, mental disturbance and emotional breakdown. Violence against ourselves and each other, dependence on alcohol.

At first the metaphor is seductive. But the more it is insisted on the more doubt and qualms creep in. Were not mental disturbance, violence and heavy drinking common in Victorian times too? (And, for that matter, in modern-day India which are, in economic and human terms, at much the same stage as the Western cities of a hundred or more years ago.) And would not Seabrook's picture of the British working class have been more convincing, as indeed his more journalistic picture of Indian poverty is – if he had not

drawn his examples exclusively from society's failures? His vignettes of the single-parent family living on junk food, of the video-nasties and the children's play going on simultaneously in the living-rooms of the unemployed are excellent, but they hardly add up to an adequate view of poverty in our time. Is the social dislocation that is ostensibly being charted perhaps some more personal and inexpressible inner journey of Seabrook's own?

Having established his metaphor to his own satisfaction, Seabrook argues backwards to it from material facts, as if unaware of any objective imperatives beyond his conspiracy of world capitalism.

The breaking and remaking of the whole character of the working class in response to a new international division of labour would never have been possible without that transformation of what came to be thought of as the "classic" landscape of capitalism. That is why during the second half of the twentieth century, the familiar images of industrialization have been so carefully re-worked. The factory chimneys with their parabola of smoke bending in the wind, the dust and heat of the foundries, the rows of houses subsiding on their ledge of a mountain of coal, the metal skeletons of the shipyards – are in the way of being effaced.

Of course it is politically satisfying and psychologically interesting to see this effacement as "sinister... a reconstruction of history". But a small voice inside one insists that all this has more to do with the coming of electrical power and the aeroplane.

You cannot pursue the conspiracy theory of events as vigorously as Seabrook does without having some alternative vision to offer, and he does. As one would expect, it is the opposite of consumerism and the profit-motif: "the goal of self-sufficiency for all". But his concept of how this kingdom of heaven upon earth should be brought about is no more carefully developed than those of the old-time preachers. He seems not to realize that trade, manufacture and indeed cities themselves are all older than history. He remarks that he has lived for some months "with great joy" in a de-monetized culture in Nagaland, where neither rice nor shelter was a marketable commodity, but as he does not allude any further, such a simple recipe for the evils of civilization seems rather like re-inventing the wheel – or perhaps de-inventing it – on the grounds that it does not work perfectly.

A third edition of A. H. Halsey's *Change in British Society* has recently been published (214pp. Oxford: University Press. £12.50). About 248 pages, 8 color illus., 37 halftones, 30 line illus., 1 map. 8 1/2 x 11". \$67.50.

Princeton

The Late Buildings of the Palace

The Sculpture of Palenque Volume III

Maria Green Robertson

The regional capital of the western quadrant of the Late Classic Maya world, Palenque reached sculptural and architectural heights never attained by any other Maya center. This is the third volume of Maria Green Robertson's photographic series on the site, which will provide the sole complete record of Palenque as it was before recent damage by volcanic ash and acid rain.

Published in association with the J. Paul Getty Trust, 472 pages, 160 color illus., 175 halftones, 112 line illus., 9 1/2 x 12", \$135.00

Already Available

Volume I: The Temple of the Inscriptions

and

Volume II: The Early Buildings of the Palace and the Wall Paintings

The Murals of Bonampak

Mary Ellen Miller

"This is the best analysis of a body of Maya art that I have ever read. The Bonampak murals are probably the most important paintings in the pre-Columbian New World, and Mary Ellen Miller's work is the most important study of them. Her book will be a classic in the literature on Mesoamerica."

—Michael D. Coe, Yale University About 248 pages, 8 color illus., 37 halftones, 30 line illus., 1 map. 8 1/2 x 11". \$67.50

The Roman Port and Fishery of Cosa

A Center of Ancient Trade

Anna Marguerite McCann

and Joanna Burgess, Elina K. Onda, John Peter Onda, and Elizabeth Lyding Will

A new center of ancient export trade in wine and fish sauce is revealed by the excavations of the earliest Roman port and fishery known and established Cosa as the center for the flourishing commercial activities of the powerful Sestian family and extends the international trading history of the Romans back to at least the early second century B.C.

750 pages, 6 color illus., 661 halftones, 489 line illus., 14 maps. 8 1/2 x 11". \$150.00

Forthcoming

Excavations at Saragane in Istanbul

Volume I

R. M. Harrison

With contributions by M. V. Giff, M. Hendy, S. J. Hill, D. Brinkwell, and K. Kormay

This work is the first volume of two that will be the full report of major excavations carried out by Dumbarton Oaks and the Istanbul Archaeological Museum at Saragane in the heart of ancient Constantinople. The main objectives of the excavations, which extended over six seasons, was the palace-church of St. Polychronios, erected by the Byzantine princess Anicia Juliana in 524-527 and hitherto known only from historical sources.

Published by Princeton University Press and Dumbarton Oaks About 472 pages, 475 halftones, 79 line illus. 8 1/2 x 11" \$125.00

Prices are in U.S. dollars

Order from your local bookseller or from

154 Sproum Road, Princeton University Press, Guildford Surrey GU1 3JT

Academic freedom and the perils of sponsorship

Richard Clogg

In the present climate of officially encouraged institutional mendacity, under a government determined to force universities into an increasing reliance on external sources of funding, it is perhaps timely to look at a little-known but classic instance of the perils inherent in sponsored scholarship, namely the imbroglio that developed over Arnold Toynbee's tenure of the Koraeas chair at King's College, London during the early 1920s. For when his writings on the Greek-Turkish war of 1919-22 and his growing sympathy for the Turkish nationalist cause aroused the wrath of the wealthy Greeks who had put up the money for the chair, Toynbee found himself in a situation in which he had no option but to resign.

The establishment of the Koraeas chair was the outcome of the philhellenic enthusiasm of the principal of the college, Ronald Burrows, and of his friendship with, and unqualified admiration for, the Greek statesman Eleftherios Venizelos, to whom he had once addressed an ode beginning "Venizelos! Venizelos! Do not fail us! Do not fail us!" It was under Burrows that King's College, with the establishment in 1915 of the School of Slavonic Studies, became a power-house of academic propaganda in favour of self-determination for the peoples of Eastern Europe. Greece, however, had always enjoyed a particular place in the affection of Burrows, a distinguished classical scholar.

Moreover, the promotion of modern Greek and Byzantine studies in the college had acquired a dimension of political urgency as the Foreign Office, if at first hesitantly, backed the Anglophil Venizelos against the neutralist King Constantine. Venizelos, then prime minister, in early 1915 offered a government subsidy for the chair, for which both he and Burrows considered the scholar-journalist William Miller, an acute and sympathetic observer of the Greek scene, to be the ideal incumbent. Miller, however, fearful that any connection with the Greek government would compromise his independence, was reluctant to stand, while Venizelos's fall from office as a result of his growing rift with the king temporarily put paid to the idea of the government subsidy.

Burrows initially had high hopes that Sir Basil Zaharoff, the enigmatic and fabulously wealthy arms dealer, would fund the chair but Zaharoff was already committed to establishing chairs in aeronautical engineering in Louvain, Paris and Petrograd. (After the war he was also to establish the Marshall Foch chair of French Literature at Oxford and the Field Marshal Earl Haig chair of English Literature at the Sorbonne.) But the fact that the project enjoyed Venizelos's blessing produced a ready response from the prosperous and very largely Venizelist Anglo-Greek community in Britain. From correspondence with one donor, Helena Schilizzi, who was subsequently to marry Venizelos, it is clear that Burrows essentially conceived the holder of the new chair as "promoting the Greek [i.e. Venizelist] cause" in Britain, in co-operation with the newly founded Anglo-Hellenic League, with his university duties taking second place.

An adequate endowment was quickly raised. Venizelos himself passed on £2,000 that he had been given by Sir Lucas Rall and, on returning to power in 1917, was able to arrange for an annual subsidy to be voted in the Greek parliament. (When a chair of modern Greek studies was established at Harvard in the mid-1970s the Greek government, fearing a row over the implications of giving a million dollars to a wealthy foreign university at a time when the Greek universities were chronically underfunded, apparently so arranged the endowment as to avoid the need for legislation in parliament.) The donors were now able to set about negotiating with the university the conditions that would attach to the chair. A proposal that it be named the Venizelos chair was dropped after objections to the naming of a chair after a living politician. Instead it was to be known as the Koraeas Chair of Modern Greek and Byzantine History, Language and Literature. Adamantios Korais, the great classical scholar and mentor of the movement for Greek independence, was, like the vast majority of the donors, of Chiot origin.

Initially, the subscribers proposed to retain

control over the endowment, making available to the university a sufficient sum annually to pay the professor's salary. The university's lawyers, however, balked at this and, through a compromise, the capital was handed over to the university until the chair should be vacated through resignation, retirement or death. At such a time the subscribers could either withdraw the endowment or propose new conditions, although the university would not be bound to accept these and would be free to return the original endowment. A proposal to restrict the chair to those of British or Greek nationality was dropped, the subscribers trusting to the "good sense" of the university not to appoint a Turk, or, for that matter, "a Bulgarian Greek". They requested that they be sent an annual scheme of the work to be carried out in the new department, together with triennial reports on which they were to have the right to make criticisms and suggestions, a condition that was later to occasion considerable trouble.

Once the small print had been hammered out, the college was free to begin its search for a suitable professor, and also for a lecturer who was to be responsible for modern Greek language teaching. Burrows conscientiously took soundings of colleagues in Britain, France (he was a particular admirer of the Sorbonne school of Byzantine and Modern Greek studies) and Greece. One Greek professor proposed his own son for the lectureship while another name to be put forward was that of "un esprit remarquable", the Alexandrian poet Constantine Cavafy, although nothing came of the suggestion. Among those consulted was the Hellenist Gilbert Murray. Murray told his son-in-law, Arnold Toynbee, of the new chair and Toynbee, who, following the resignation in 1915 of his Balliol fellowship in ancient history, had been working for the Foreign Office, made tentative enquiries of Burrows.

Toynbee, however, was not only somewhat deterred by the vast range of expertise subsumed in the title of the Koraeas chair but thought that its holder should be more of "an active philhellene" than he felt himself to be. Burrows nevertheless strongly encouraged him to apply, confident that the more Toynbee became immersed in the subject the more he would develop a sympathetic interest in the history and people of Greece. He could, moreover, see nothing in Toynbee's writings that would give him any qualms as to his philhellenism. Indeed Toynbee, besides compiling on behalf of Lord Bryce a dossier of evidence of Turkish atrocities against the Armenians which had been published as a government Blue Book, had also written, as part of his war service, a propaganda tract entitled *The Murderous Tyranny of the Turks*. In this work, replete with old-fashioned anti-Turkish rhetoric, Toynbee had dismissed the Ottoman Empire as a vampire state which "literally drained its victims' blood". He was subsequently to repudiate it as a manifestation of traditional Western prejudice against the Turk.

The field for the chair was a strong one and included A.W. Gomme, the classical scholar, and John Jackson, whose probationary fellowship at Magdalen College, Oxford, had not been renewed on account of heavy drinking, but who was regarded by one of his referees as "a genius, sort of second person in his gift for Greek of all sorts". From the outset Toynbee had clearly been a leading contender and he was duly elected to the chair in March 1919, the electors including Joannes Gennadius, until recently the long-serving Greek minister in London. A bibliophile and, albeit dogmatic, a scholar in his own right, Gennadius had himself had his eyes on the chair but, being in his late sixties, was disqualified on grounds of age, much to Burrows's relief.

Shortly after the election Toynbee suffered a mild breakdown but was fully recovered by the beginning of the autumn term, 1919, when he delivered a characteristically wide-ranging inaugural lecture on "The Place of Mediaeval and Modern Greece in History". Venizelos was in the audience in the Great Hall at King's College and Gennadius took the chair. Toynbee, indeed, was mildly put out by Gennadius's lengthy introductory peroration. For this included an outburst warning the professor against the propagation of "the queer fancies of Mr Psichari and his concert of socialist youths", Yannis Psicharis being no doubt a

champion of demotic Greek as Gennadius was of the *katharevousa*, or "purified" form. Shortly afterwards Burrows was taken seriously ill, and he died a few months later. His death may have been premature but at least he was spared the funous controversy that was before long to engulf the one project which, of his many innovations in the college, undoubtedly lay closest to his heart.

Toynbee was clearly not over-burdened with teaching and, at the end of his first year at King's, was granted two terms study leave to travel in the Greek lands, which now included a sizeable slice of western Asia Minor that had been allocated to Greece under the treaty of Sèvres. Toynbee, hitherto a severe critic of the Turks' treatment of their Christian minorities, was anxious to observe at first hand how the Greeks were behaving now that the boot was on the other foot and they were charged with governing a large Muslim population. To cover his expenses and to give him better access to officials he travelled as a special correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*.

During the first half of 1921, as the Greek occupation forces in western Asia Minor were coming under increasing challenge by the Turkish nationalist forces commanded by Mustafa Kemal (Atatürk), Toynbee travelled freely and extensively in the Greek-controlled areas. It was while visiting Ephesus in February that he underwent the most vivid of the several "experiences of the local annihilation of Time in places where Time had stood still" that occurred at various points in his life. On this occasion the theatre had come to life with a tumultuous throng chanting "Great is Diana". (It was also about the time that he took up the Koraeas chair that, walking one day along Buckingham Palace Road, he had become directly aware of "the passage of History gently flowing through him in a mighty current".)

During the course of his travels Toynbee became increasingly doubtful about Greece's *mission civilisatrice* in Asia Minor. He had come across disturbing evidence of the anti-Turkish violence which had accompanied the Greek landings in Smyrna in May 1919, while in May 1921 he and his wife were to encounter in the Yalova region first-hand evidence of atrocities committed by the Greek army. In dispatches to the *Manchester Guardian* he reported, on the undisguised "malignity and inhumanity" of the Greek military authorities. Whereas Greek officials had gone out of their way to facilitate his travels, his efforts to get behind the Turkish lines had met with refusal, for his work for Lord Bryce and his credentials as the representative of the most Gladstonian of British newspapers cut predictably little ice with the Turkish authorities.

Toynbee was under no illusion that similar outrages had been committed on the Turkish side, but the fact that he had personally witnessed Greek atrocities left a particular impression on him. On his return he sought, through his journalistic writings, by addressing public meetings and, above all, through the publication of *The Western Question in Greece and Turkey*, to alert public opinion to the inevitability of a tragic dénouement to Greece's Anatolian entanglement. Written within a matter of months, *The Western Question* was published shortly before the catastrophic defeat of the Greek forces in Asia Minor by the Turkish nationalists in September, 1922.

Given that one of his basic conclusions was that the Greeks had demonstrated that they were no more fitted than the Turks for governing a mixed population, Toynbee was well aware that such a book, written by the Koraeas professor, was likely to prove painful to Greek readers. From an academic point of view, however, he believed this to be less unfortunate than if his conclusions had been favourable to Greece and unfavourable to Turkey. For at least the suspicion was precluded that "an annihilation of learning in a British university" had been used to carry out propaganda on behalf of the country with which it was concerned. At the time of its publication he repeated the offer of resignation that he had made in May 1921 to Ernest Barker, who had succeeded Burrows as principal of the college. The initial offer had been made by the same post as he had first reported on Greek atrocities. On both occasions Barker had refused to accept it.

The reaction that Toynbee had anticipated

was not long in coming. Before the year was out Major G. Melas had published (in *How the Turk as he is: answer to a libel: the Hellenic Kennalism, Bolshevism and Pan-Germanism*) his attack on Toynbee as "unsatiated hatred for the Greeks" but his attitude that he had been bought by the Turks. An implicit condemnation of his views was compiled by a member of Toynbee's own department, Lysimachos Oeconomos, who taught modern Greek. This attack on "the Moloch of Eosier Christendom, was in part written to counter Toynbee's suggestion, on which he was subsequently to change his mind, that the great fire which had destroyed much of "infidel Smyrna" on the arrival of the Turkish army had been started not by the Turks but by the fleeing Greeks.

More ominously, the Greeks who had put up the money for the chair, grouped in the subscribers' committee, now began to put pressure on the university to terminate Toynbee's tenure of it. The initial pretext for their intervention was his failure to provide the donors with either an annual scheme of work or the triennial reports of the department's activities which had been requested when the endowment had been handed over to the university. Although neither Toynbee nor the principal had ever been informed of this stipulation, he hastened to provide the required report. On the basis of this, the subscribers' committee, discreetly advised by William Pember Reeves, the director of the London School of Economics and like Burrows an ardent philhellene, now complained to the university of the "manifestly poor results" achieved by Toynbee during his first three years in the chair.

These it attributed to his being so demonstrably out of sympathy with the "mentality and legitimate aspirations" of the people whose history and literature he professed. Toynbee had emerged as one of Greece's bitterest critics, so much so indeed that it was difficult to distinguish between him and the "professional advocates" of Turkey. The subscribers contended that the moral obligations incumbent on a gentleman and a scholar required Toynbee to make a clear choice between championing the cause of the Turk and Bulgar and the holding of the Koraeas chair. The endowment should not be used to sustain a "public source of injury" to Greece and the subscribers asked the university authorities to consider whether Toynbee's continuance in the chair was compatible with the object of its foundation.

From the outset, Toynbee was to enjoy the support of the college principal, Barker, who took a firm stand on the principle of academic freedom involved; and at every stage of the ensuing controversy he was advised by Gilbert Murray. He needed all the support he could get, for he not only had the subscribers' committee to contend with but also a powerful phalanx within the King's professoriate, led by R.W. Seton-Watson, the Masaryk Professor of Central European History and the leading light in the School of Slavonic Studies. Seton-Watson and his colleagues believed that the donors had every right to feel aggrieved and feared that the controversy would lead to the demise of a chair so closely linked with Burrows's memory.

A further concern was that the quarrel over the doors of the Koraeas endowment might threaten the whole edifice of subsidy from foreign governments on which the School of Slavonic Studies at that time rested. (The school was subsidised by the London County Council.) In the early 1920s, as much as the quarter of the School's income came from foreign governments. It received subsidies from the Czech, Polish and Yugoslav authorities and, at the height of the Toynbee imbroglio, began to negotiate a further subsidy from the Romanian government. In the case of Seton-Watson's own chair, the inhibition of the donors prevented the Koraeas chair being named after Professor T.G. Masaryk, a name which Venizelos appear to have weakened, named after Professor T.G. Masaryk, a member of the School of Slavonic Studies at the time the chair was instituted, the point of Czechoslovakia.

Given the federal structure of the university of London, the Toynbee question became as much a university as a college

Letters

Disease and the Novel

Sir, - With Sharon R. Smith (Letters, January 17) I have some sympathy, though I am not sure why she should call my original review irritable and defensive. The relationship between mind and body is without question one of the most fascinating and difficult issues, I would say the most fascinating and difficult, in the whole realm of philosophical speculation. If she cares to read my *Against Criticism*, she will understand that it was in part to trade mere speculation on this issue for what first-hand experience can be gained, that I came to be studying medicine in the first place. On such an issue, simple answers will be wrong. I would readily agree with her that in the medical context we often err towards one kind of simplification. In the literary context I happened to be discussing we err towards another. Like her, I believe that mind and body often influence one another, and indeed that was a point I made explicit in my review. Unlike her, I am not convinced that diseases are "communicating" with us (sometimes rather too late) and I am convinced that in many cases it is unhelpful as well as unkind to suggest that they are. "Any observant psychotherapist" will know that unnecessary guilt and a sense of inadequacy often attach to disease, and that part of the healing process is letting them go.

Then there is Arthur Kleinman (Letters, January 31). With enemies like Kleinman, who keeps friends? From the vantage point of his "the world", extending perhaps beyond the very boundaries of the Harvard Department of Anthropology, he is able to reassure us that the cosmos - the entire sum of all that exists - is no more than "the socially constituted order that several generations of anthropologists of religion and historians of science have disclosed". Once you see this, of course you'll spot the disease in social constructs. Well, now I think I've really heard it all. The claim that *King Lear* is a self-referential word game seems the worst kind of stuff by comparison.

"Skillfully crafted" as he kindly calls my review, it unfortunately wasn't skillfully crafted enough to get through to the likes of Kleinman. In his luxuriously tooled response, he seems to have got a bit lost, and it would make unreasonable demands on space and the reader's patience to lead him out of the labyrinth. So let me simply address his central problem: this time in words of one syllable. Nobody "denies" that people interpret disease and give it a meaning. That was, precisely, my point. There is an irresistible desire to give meaning to the meaningless, and the often touching, brave, sad, imaginative, life-affirming or pathetically human expressions of such an instinct are what we are supposed to recognize in Kleinman's pedantic babble about "personal and interpersonal significances that constitute our life-world". Of course, such human expressions, like all human expressions, to some degree reflect the culture from which they come - nothing could be more wearisomely commonplace than that; though at the Department of Anthropology at Harvard this seems to be not new, calling forth from Kleinman, in the scene of his delirium, an inebricated blather about the "symbolic reticulum (the sociological dialectic)". All of this has nothing to do with the problem for a novelist, which is this: why should it be a particular character - say, Michel, or Hans - who gets a particular disease, say, tuberculosis? And it is this which forces him to do violence to his characters by making them somehow "deserve" their disease. The question is not why an ill man should have his disease in a certain way, but why he should have it at all. Anthropologists may deal with types, but novelists and doctors must be concerned with individuals.

Now I can't tell whether this is incomprehensible to Kleinman because he doesn't understand the nature of literature, or because he doesn't understand disease. When he strays into medical territory, he appears to get it wrong - misunderstanding the distinction between signs and symptoms, for example, and apparently believing cerebrovascular disease to be an acute disorder (as though that were anyway relevant to his argument). Could it be that he is a "serious ethnographer of the work of doctors"? Perhaps he and Sharon Smith (an "observant psychotherapist") would like to come on the medical wards round here, and explain to a middle-aged woman I have watched dying - drained and exhausted - of a genetically determined social construct which has altered her personality, estranged her from her family, rendered her speechless and incontinent, and compelled her to spend her (possibly many) remaining days and nights in perpetual, senseless contortions which will one day result in her choking to death - perhaps they would explain to her how it is that she is responsible for her disease, and what she can bring from their "life world" to illuminate her "illness episode".

IAIN MCGILCHRIST,
7 Park Lane, Twyford, Winchester, Hampshire.

into medical territory, he appears to get it wrong - misunderstanding the distinction between signs and symptoms, for example, and apparently believing cerebrovascular disease to be an acute disorder (as though that were anyway relevant to his argument). Could it be that he is a "serious ethnographer of the work of doctors"? Perhaps he and Sharon Smith (an "observant psychotherapist") would like to come on the medical wards round here, and explain to a middle-aged woman I have watched dying - drained and exhausted - of a genetically determined social construct which has altered her personality, estranged her from her family, rendered her speechless and incontinent, and compelled her to spend her (possibly many) remaining days and nights in perpetual, senseless contortions which will one day result in her choking to death - perhaps they would explain to her how it is that she is responsible for her disease, and what she can bring from their "life world" to illuminate her "illness episode".

IAIN MCGILCHRIST,
7 Park Lane, Twyford, Winchester, Hampshire.

Spender's 'Journals'

Sir, - Just to give thanks to Joseph Brodsky for his extraordinary letter in support of Stephen Spender's "right to life" as poet and diarist (December 27). Or to thank God that there's still someone like Brodsky to come forward with such a letter in this poisonous time.

MARY MCCARTHY,
141 rue de Rennes, Paris.

'Galileo and His Sources'

Sir, - William A. Wallace (Letters, January 3) poses as a man of wounded virtue and tries to present our patient efforts for over a decade to maintain the truth as a series of attacks. He would do well simply to own up to the evidence. We will focus on one crucial question: had Wallace identified our Jesuit sources for Galileo's scholastic essays before he received the letter of March 1, 1972, from the first of us (A.C.C.) informing him of our discoveries?

There are two pieces of documentary evidence. One is Wallace's paper "Galileo and the Thomists" which he sent to A.C.C. in typescript on July 16, 1971 (before its publication unchanged in 1974). The other is his application for a grant from the US National Science Foundation. We have already published this evidence in our paper "The Jesuits and Galileo's Ideas of Science and Nature" (1983) p. 11, n. 11, to which A.C.C. referred in his review in the *TLS* (November 22, 1985). As we pointed out, Wallace wrote in his paper that "there is no evidence of direct copying from any of the Thomist authors mentioned in this study". He noted that if the source were a professor at Pisa, he "would appear to be sympathetic to the writings of two members of the newly-founded Society of Jesus, Pererius and Toletus" (p. 327) and continued: "Who this professor might be is a question that is not easily answered." He concluded that his inquiry had yielded "these largely negative results" (p. 329). He made no claim to have identified these two Jesuits as Galileo's sources, and he did not mention Clavius at all. The purpose of his letter enclosing his paper was in fact to ask for support for a proposal to the NSF for a study of the *Juvenilia* and the identification of their sources. Jesuit authors and the Collegio Romano were not mentioned in his copy of this proposal that he later sent us (noted as received on September 30, 1971), which specified quite other directions of search. Supposing that Wallace did mean to exclude Pereira and Toletus from "the Thomist authors" (Jesuits could be Thomists), why did he write that the question was "not easily answered" and the results "largely negative", if he already knew what we were to tell him about our three Jesuits; why did he not mention Clavius or the Collegio Romano in his NSF application; and why did he not mention Clavius at all? The answer is obvious. As A.C.C. put it to his paper, "Sources of Galileo's early natural philosophy" (1973) p. 170: "William Wallace noticed certain similarities with Pereira and Toletus, but saw them only among

others through a glass darkly and failed to identify them as sources". We have to add that Wallace's suggestion that our discoveries are undocumented is simply false. The correspondences between Galileo's texts and those of our three Jesuits are all specified, with relevant and often lengthy quotations, in the section of our book which A.C.C. sent him in 1973. All he had to do was to look them up.

Wallace claims that in 1972, after the second of us (A.C.C.) had given him a copy of his transcription of MS 27 containing Galileo's logical essay, he compared it with Carbone's *Addamentis* and "marked parallel passages that seemed to suggest copying". He did not mention this either to us or in the footnote added later to his paper "Galileo and the Thomists" in which he thanked A.C. for his transcription. If what he claims now is true, why was he so reticent then? Again he claims that in Milan in June 1975 he gave A.C. a "photocopy of the 1597 text" of the *Addamentis* on which he "had marked parallels with Galileo's notes in MS 27", but he had not so marked the photocopy. In fact, when they met, A.C. told Wallace that he had identified the *Addamentis* as the source copied (sometimes word for word) by Galileo and showed him a list of textual correspondences. (A.C. had announced this discovery at a conference held in April 1975 at Santa Margherita Ligure.) Wallace admitted then that he had not yet compared his photocopy with Galileo's text. It was A.C.'s information that alerted him to the significance of his microfilms. One problem for us in this affair is that Wallace seems unable to grasp the practice of giving other scholars information for their private use. Within the civilized republic of letters, this means that the recipient does not publish them himself, and certainly not as his own. Likewise Wallace seems unable to grasp the difference between the general similarities among a wide range of contemporary scholars' writings on natural philosophy and the precise correspondences that identify the sources Galileo actually used, or again between pursuing "a line of investigation" and making a discovery. We cannot in the space available here deal with all the misinformation, self-contradictions and humbug which make up the bulk of Wallace's long letter, but if anyone wishes to pursue the subject further they may write to us privately.

A. C. CROMBIE,
Trinity College, Oxford.
ADRIANO CARUGO,
Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, New Jersey 08540.

The Brothers Adam
Sir, - In a review published on December 13, Kerry Downes said that none of the houses in the Adam brothers' Adelphi project was left, and in his recent letter (January 31) he insists that the houses are a "total loss", whatever fragments of masonry may or may not survive. (my italics). I presume he knows that thirteen of the four-storey houses survive, that they are in three blocks with a combined street frontage of 450 feet, that they possess three façades with attractive pilasters, and that they contain between them more Adam ceilings than can be found in almost any of Adam's country houses. If the nation's planners ever find out that a professor of history dismisses all this work by one of the nation's greatest architects as "fragments" whose very existence should not be acknowledged, then what hope will ordinary mortals have of persuading them to treat the buildings of lesser architects with any respect at all?

DAVID N. KING,
14 Greenhaugh Way, Brack, Dunblane, Perthshire.

The first winner of the Anglo-Hellenic League's annual Ruinman Award for a work of fiction, poetry, drama or non-fiction about Greece, is David Constantine for his *Early Greek Travellers and the Hellenic Ideal* (reviewed in the *TLS* of October 12, 1984).

To celebrate the fifteenth anniversary of the London Book Fair, its organizers and the National Book League are awarding a literary prize for the best travel book on London published in the last three years. Further information may be obtained from the Publicity Officer, National Book League, Book House, 41 East Hill, London SW18 2QZ.

Unequal Opportunities

Women's Employment in England 1800-1918

Edited by ANGELA V. JOHN

This specially-commissioned chapter in this book look critically at nineteenth-century employment issues from the neglected perspectives of women employees and organizers, uncovering a vast range of unexplored experiences, opportunities and obstacles facing Victorian women. 312 pages, illustrated, hardback £25.00 (0 631 13955 5) paperback £8.95 (0 631 13956 7)

Labour and Love

Women's Experience of Home and the Family 1850-1940

Edited by JANE LEWIS

In this companion volume to *Unequal Opportunities* a group of feminist historians seeks to further our understanding of women's experience of home and family during a period in which prevailing attitudes dictated that a woman's place was in the home. 288 pages, illustrated, hardback £25.00 (0 631 13957 5) paperback £8.95 (0 631 13958 3)

A Woman's Place

An Oral History of Working Class Women ELIZABETH ROBERTS

'A fine piece of social history, important as a contribution to the history of women and the common people in general... amply readable... A book to which all future historians of the working class will be indebted.' *Times Higher Education Supplement* 'Highly readable... for a convincing picture of working class life this book is hard to beat.' *New Society* 254 pages, illustrated, hardback £14.95 (0 631 13672 3) paperback £5.95 (0 631 14764 3)

Women's Studies

A Bibliography of Dissertations 1870-1982

Compiled by V. F. GILBERT and D. S. TATLA

A unique bibliography which categorizes over 12,000 unpublished dissertations ranging over all disciplines relevant to women's studies. An enormous quantity of research, carried out on both sides of the Atlantic, is at last made accessible with this indispensable reference tool. Blackwell Reference 512 pages, £27.50 (0 631 13714 6)

The Captured Womb

A History of the Medical Care of Pregnant Women ANN OAKLEY

'A cool and clever book... *Times* 'A rich and important contribution to the history of ante-natal care.' *New Society* 'Challenging... a clear, interesting and informative analysis which should be of interest not only to historians and sociologists but to all parents.' *Times Literary Supplement* 364 pages, illustrated, hardback £17.50 (0 631 14152 8) paperback £5.95 (0 631 14971 6)

Basil Blackwell

108 Cowley Road, Oxford OX4 1JF
Basil Blackwell, 350 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10017

A plan without a maze

Andrew Saint

SPYRO KOSTOF

A History of Architecture: Settings and rituals 788pp, with black-and-white drawings New York: Oxford University Press. \$45. 019 503724

To write the complete history of architecture is to write the history of mankind. If the same may be said about every great subject, the case of architecture differs from the rest of the pack of human obsessions commonly drawn together under the rubric of "arts". Buildings and environments are required, cannot be escaped, compel and are in their turn compelled. So architecture shares its basic history with technology, agriculture or dress, not with music or painting, the subjects with which it is most often lumped. Literature perhaps can be claimed as a special case, for who can escape the word? But in comparison with architecture, literature relates to the lurching progress of civilization obliquely, more as commentary and less as pure testament. This testamentary aspect distinguishes an all-encompassing history of architecture from that of any of the other arts, and exacts from its aspiring author the scope of a Buckle or a Toynbee.

In embarking upon the most ambitious English-language history of the world's architecture since Banister Fletcher, Spiro Kostof might have been forgiven some early fence-building, some territorial reductions to make his task more manageable and intelligible. One might in particular have anticipated some sort of revisionist decrees as to the running of the respective writs of "architecture" and "building". Pevsner, pronouncing in his *Outline of European Architecture*, was crisp and decisive: "A bicycle shed is a building; Lincoln Cathedral is a piece of architecture". In other words, aesthetic ambition and a conscious sense of design had to be proven before a historian was obliged to take a building seriously. Nowadays we are less sure. Vernacular architecture is admired the world over, and we smart from the blows of those who failed to heed our total environment, who dismantled the bicycle sheds because they could discern no cathedrals. Professor Kostof's introductory response to this is a hungry one: anything built is admitted to the architectural canon. More, indeed: architecture is to be judged, in relation to a "broader physical framework and not just in terms of itself", as well as to a complete set of material and historical values and purposes.

This hungry hunger for inclusiveness explains the length of Kostof's triple-columned book. What then are its principles of discrimination, and how sharp does the author's appetite remain as he gobbles up the centuries? The subtitle, "Settings and rituals", offers the intended frame of interpretation. The words appear chosen in careful avoidance of a staler pair, "styles and functions". They may have been selected early on, as Kostof grappled with the lost cities of the Near East, with stone circles, temple complexes and the whole wordless witness of the antique. Ancient building devours a valiant third of the book, much of it devoted to the shaping and sociology of communities. With the choice of "settings" there can be no quarrel, as the commitment is a sustained one. Whether his topic is Chichén Itzá and Hattusas, the growth of medieval French towns, the papal reincarnation of Rome, pre-Columbian Mexico and Peru, or the centurion of virgin American territory, Kostof furnishes an empirical account of town planning richer and more discursive than anything previously on offer.

"Rituals" is not so happy. Kostof asks the term to embrace commodity, function and purpose, the effect proposed by architecture on the human mind as well as the service it provides for the human frame, to paraphrase Ruskin. But it proves too elusive to give shape to the book. Kostof intends it as a way of escaping the sterility of functionalism, a device for reconciling his empirical endeavours with the fashionable issue of "meaning" in architecture. This thread is soon lost. Instead, as the pages go by, the reader perceives a familiar agenda (never explicitly admitted) reasserting itself: the history of architectural style, above all the classical style.

Such further dissemination as takes place in

Kostof's digestion of his great global meal does so because of who he is and where he is. At the start of the book he likens the reader to the recumbent stylite depicted in a painting by Thomas Cole, "The Architect's Dream", watching the panorama of the world's buildings unfold before him "like a hybrid movie set". Consciously or not, Kostof's is a view of world architecture seen from the California college lecture hall. The panoramic reel rolls by, astutely cut by a director with great gifts for synthesis, narrative, the glowing description and the telling phrase. The United States are "we" or "us" and receive a hefty but never prejudicial apportionment of space in the last third of the book, which goes under a title too reminiscent of the "ma generation", "The Search for Self". Happily, its contents belie this seeming preoccupation with the architecture of the lotus-eaters.

Western Europe cannot complain about its coating. The author knows his Greece, Italy, France and Britain inside out, although he is slight on Germany and Austria and very thin on Scandinavia and Russia. Beyond that the geographical picture is disappointing, all the more so after some sharp opening words have damned Banister Fletcher's *History of Architecture on the Comparative Method* for its disparagement of Eastern building traditions. Kostof sails off in good spirits to Asia and Egypt and soon drops in at China, Africa and India, but we hardly hear of their cultures again. Pre-Columbian America is better served, and there are valuable passages on Islamic architecture and planning. A preface concedes the shortcoming, pleading that the inclusion of other cultures, however partial, at least stops Western architecture from appearing as "an insulated and wholly logical progression". But the mere juxtaposition in Kostof's brilliant urban evocations of Florence and Cairo, Venice and Istanbul (all essentially Mediterranean cities) does not prevent that appearance. Western architectural values go in effect unchallenged. Since these values now reign in cities the world over the bias may not be an unreasonable one, but it diminishes the claim to inclusiveness. At the least, some account of

Western architecture's impact upon indigenous cultures was needed, to balance the patient clarity with which Kostof explains what the West took from elsewhere.

This, then, is at bottom a traditional history of architectural development. It is expounded with concentration, elegance and consistency, but it does not disturb shibboleths or venture alternative priorities. Except for the valuable insistence on totalities and a certain humility of tone, it might have been written decades ago. Mies, Le Corbusier and Gropius remain the three kings of modern architecture, dethroned perhaps from the seats of current fashion but still proffering their gifts of unquestioned value. Further back, the conventional moral linkages between politics, culture and art may be attenuated but they are never quite broken, despite passing approval for Geddes's dictum that architectural form may not be perfected until the institution it embodies is close to decay. Periclean Athens, for instance, stands unshaken at the centre of Kostof's loving account of classical Greek architecture. Tyrants or oligarchs may build as well as slave-owning democracies, but they contrive to appear less pertinent to our tastes; and though the international architecture of late Hellenism is no longer dismissed, so sophisticated a city as Pergamon has still to be seen by virtue of its hapless position in the political cycle as a piece of nostalgia, a falling-off from what went before, a "swan song". In the same way, Perpendicular and Flamboyant flit quickly by because they belong to the "florid Gothic sunset".

Often Kostof allows himself the alibi political judgment, not good for the American student who is going to be the book's chief reader. Republican Florence becomes the focus of an argument about personal freedoms and natural rights; after the First World War, "a left-wing revolutionary fervor was now abroad" all over Europe, where the concentration of workers on housing estates "could be said to fulfill the Marxist doctrine of raising class consciousness". Such jarring generalizations arise not from any coarseness of intellectual approach or political understanding, but from the straits to which Kostof is driven in the search for an

organizing principle. For when it is considered on the scale attempted in this book, the history of architecture is a very messy business. What Kostof admits the mess, and acknowledges the disparity of scales and styles to be found in any one city or at any one time, when his sweeps from the Turkish mosque to the small house, or from Italy to France or Germany and back again, he does outstandingly well. The reader never has the least trouble in following him.

Because of this ability, it is a shame that so much of the discussion, from Karnak to the Illinois Institute of Technology, is geared to the history of the classical tradition in architecture. Kostof's Mediterranean predilections lead him to uphold classicism as the international bond of Western architecture, the central position from which deviation took place at certain times. But he overstates the degree of acceptance which classicism enjoyed in European and American building, whereas it is construed as planning principle or as an architectural language. It can, for instance, be argued that ordinary houses, in which Kostof takes a spasmodic interest, were only lightly touched by classical influences before the nineteenth century. Again, in the England of the early Stuarts, one can find the classical extremism of Inigo Jones rubbing shoulders with late "prodigy" houses of the Elizabethan type, a revived castle or two, the occasional Gothic church, and an entirely different tradition of timber-framed housing of those Kostof mentions only Jones. English architecture may be cranky and picturesque but it is not unique. A homogeneous style of building in any one country is exceptional, the usual, and it ought to be a part of any complete history of architecture to admit this simple but rarely expressed truth. Kostof goes half-way there. He is far from moralistic about the conservatism of the nineteenth century, and at the end of the book he does his best to be relaxed about what he calls "the present disorder", the architectural pluralism of our most recent times. Do we really need an all-pervasive style for today? he asks. The answer is reasonably no; and, thank goodness, we have never had one.

Tansor are consistently impressive. Watson has perhaps the best Norman castle in the county, Bulwick a steeple worthy to compare with Oundle's; Polebrook, with its extensive arched plan, is admirably unsuited. The Cotswolds don't really explain the Cotswold plan; but an interesting chronological survey of plans enables one to follow the growth of the centuries of all twenty-two medieval churches. There are likewise plans of all the historical house-forms, for which a new classification, following Eric Meier's work on nuclear houses, has been evolved.

Two, or perhaps four, monuments stand out in the enormous early seventeenth-century celebration of Sir Anthony Munday. Apethorpe, one of the most impressive mansions in England, and the Lynton manor, a Southwick, here (following Gainsborough) attributed to the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there is none of the first rank. Less one counts the noble fourteenth-century surviving at Southwick; and, as mentioned, at Nassington. The pair of identical portraits of the two Dukes of York founded and built Forthringhay have a formal frigidity. Of houses, apart from Apethorpe there

The Age of Anxiety

Blake Morrison

If children's literature in the 1960s exemplified a neo-Romanticism, with childhood seen as an age of holy if sometimes unruly innocence, we are now passing into an Age of Anxiety in which books for four-to-seven-year-olds worry away at the worries of the young. From sibling rivalry and peer group aggression to the problem of having an overbearing single parent or too small a bedroom, the present clutch of picture books seek to "cure" or reassure troubled children by bringing their difficulties into the open. But admiration for such sensitivity and "awareness" is tempered by the feeling that few of these picture books demonstrate that relish for narrative which distinguishes the best children's literature. It may be no coincidence that the most imaginative of them is, simply, wordless. John Prater's *The Gift* begins with a workaday psychological insight—that children are often more interested in the boxes containing presents than in the presents themselves—but thereafter achieves narrative lift-off as a brother and sister steer their magic cardboard box through the air, under the sea and into remote jungles. If rather indebted in format to Raymond Briggs's *The Snowman*, it is no less engrossing a tale for that.

Judy Blume's *The Pain and the Great One*, on the other hand, illustrates the problem of the problem picture book. Dedicated to "the original Pain and Great One with love", it explores an elder sister's jealous resentment of her younger brother and vice versa: the droopy illustrations of peeved stares and sulky mouths bear out the message that what each child wants is, in Auden's phrase, "not universal love / but to be loved alone". But there is no story, no development, no structure beyond a fearfully obvious symmetry of her tale and his: the narrative vacancy swallows up the book's cathartic intentions.

Mary Rayner's *Crocodarling* is no less earnestly Freudianizing and no more of a story. Sam's attachment to his soppy christened toy reptile evidently bears some relation to his worries about nursery school and in particular

about the bullying Henry. The characterization is authentic enough—awkward toddler, impatient mother ("I've had about enough of this today, now what's the matter?"), projection of tangled feelings on to the wretched pet crocodile—but the story is lacking in direction, as if unsure what to make of its psychological insights. The same holds true for Mary Dickinson's *Jilly*. *You Look Terrible*, about a small girl who defies her mother by running amok with clothes and make-up at a wedding, the drawings are insistently cheerful, the text ideologically correct (single parent, multi-racial wedding party, "understanding" adults) but the dénouement is disappointing, and the story restricts its potential readership to little girls who like dressing up.

Mira Lobe's *Christopher Wants a Party* is more enterprising. If they were not still living in the tiny two-room bachelor pad his father had before marrying, Christopher could have friends round for his birthday. Instead he must sit tearfully in a posh tea-shop, ignored by his mother and granny, and patronized by the waiter. The cake-stand comes to his rescue, lifting him tier by tier into a sequence of compensatory dream-worlds, all of them bustling with children, and in the process providing the centre of the book with a gimmicky pull-out supplement. Back down to earth, Christopher finds his fortunes changing for the better and his small bedroom expanding excitingly. Winifred Oppenorth's drawings blend the modern urban world with the grimy gothic.

Gothic is more apparent in Juliet and Charles Snape's *Where Do the Wicked Witches Live?*, in which a small boy roams widely to find the answer to that question, continually (it seems) being sent on false tracks but in fact (or on closer examination) missing what is under his nose: the book uses the old ploy of the hidden picture, as witches and their spooky paraphernalia conceal themselves in the textures of trees, rocks, houses, clouds. A child's fascination with and fear of the unknown is also the theme of *Knock Knock Who's There?*, as a girl in bed with her teddy imagines (in answer to her question) a series of horrible creatures outside her door: less terrified readers will

find the answer to that question, continually (it seems) being sent on false tracks but in fact (or on closer examination) missing what is under his nose: the book uses the old ploy of the hidden picture, as witches and their spooky paraphernalia conceal themselves in the textures of trees, rocks, houses, clouds. A child's fascination with and fear of the unknown is also the theme of *Knock Knock Who's There?*, as a girl in bed with her teddy imagines (in answer to her question) a series of horrible creatures outside her door: less terrified readers will



Banderilleros about to be defeated by Ferdinand; one of Robert Lawson's illustrations from *Munro Leaf's classic tale of passive resistance*, *The Story of Ferdinand* (Hamish Hamilton, £3.95, 0 241 90777 4), which was first published in 1937 and has recently been reissued.

notice that all of these monsters wear the same pair of bedroom slippers and will thus be less surprised by the father's reassuring entrance, on the last page; but, surprised or not, they won't mind reading the book again.

Two books explore children's relationships with old people. The strength of Niki Daly's *Not So Fast Songololo*—about a boy going to buy new shoes with his grandma, and set in (and using dialect from) southern Africa—is its superbly articulate drawings of blacks; the text is verbose in comparison, the story-line thin. James Stevenson's pictures are likewise the saving grace of *I Know A Lady*, by Charlotte Zolotow, a preachy homage to elderliness with a bafflingly oxymoronic conclusion: "If I was an old lady and she was a little girl I would love her a lot the way I do now."

With all the pitfalls awaiting the writer who attempts psychoanalysis, social work or child guidance, it is easy to see why animals retain their appeal. Where naturalistic accounts of toddlers remain earthbound, pigs can fly: "two legs bad, four legs good" is a motto by which many children's authors have profited. But Inga Moore's tale of a pig, *The Truffle Hunter*, her follow-up to the excellent *The Vegetable Thief*, is original, off-beat and without palpable design upon its audience. Despite the title, it is not a hook for or about a gourmet: poor

Marine wouldn't know a truffle, if she had one, which is why her exasperated chef finally abandons her in the woods of the doghouse. But in a Lascaux-like cave, she meets Raoul, a wild boar who teaches her to recognize truffles, rediscover her porcine essence, and pack up "civilization" for good. The drawings of rural France, no apt for this Roaneseesque tale, are splendid.

John Prater: *The Gift*. Bockley Head. £3.95, 0 241 90777 4.

Judy Blume: *The Pain and the Great One*. Dutton by Irene Trivas. Heinemann. £5.95, 0 241 90777 4.

Mary Rayner: *Crocodarling*. Collins. £3.95, 0 241 90777 4.

Mary Dickinson: *Jilly*. *You Look Terrible*. Illustrated by Joanna Stubbs. Deutsch. £3.95, 0 241 90777 4.

Mira Lobe: *Christopher Wants a Party*. Illustrated by Winifred Oppenorth and translated by John Carter. Oxford University Press. £4.95, 0 19 27800 5.

Juliet and Charles Snape: *Where Do the Wicked Witches Live?* Julia MacRae. £5.25, 0 86203 281 5. Sally Grindley: *Knock Knock Who's There?* Illustrated by Anthony Browne. Hamish Hamilton. £5.50, 0 241 11559 0.

Niki Daly: *Not So Fast Songololo*. Gallancz. £4.50, 0 241 11559 0.

Charlotte Zolotow: *I Know A Lady*. Illustrated by James Stevenson. Hutchinson. £5.95, 0 19 27800 5.

Inga Moore: *The Truffle Hunter*. Andersen. £5.95, 0 241 11559 0.

Fast and frantic

Heather O'Donoghue

TERRY JONES
Nicobobinus
Illustrated by Michael Foreman
175pp. Poyllon. £7.95.
1 85145 000 9

Nicobobinus is the story of the adventure of a boy and girl in a fantasy world of dragons, moving mountains and shark-infested seas. The illustrations are good and the narrative is funny, exciting and extraordinarily inventive. But although it seems to have all the ingredients of a successful children's book, it is unsatisfactory in several respects. *Nicobobinus*, the name of the boy in the story (his partner, a girl called Rosie, is not represented in the title) is itself an uncertain start—it is neither witty nor catchy, and none of the several ways it might be pronounced gives a very natural rhythm in English.

As a character, *Nicobobinus* is equally elusive. The book begins by calling him "the most extraordinary child who ever stuck his tongue out at the Prime Minister"—a good simple comic line, but since his adventures begin and end in medieval Venice, and mostly take place in a sort of never-never land, a distracting inappropriate one. Moreover, the promise of an iconoclastic, naughty hero is never fulfilled; *Nicobobinus* never comes alive as a character the reader might admire, identify with, or be shocked at. In fact, although we are also told that he "could do anything", *Nicobobinus* is disappointingly feeble, and spends much of the story unpleasantly coddled by two heavy, dragging, golden feet after a terrifying encounter with a malevolent golden man.

Rosie initially seems promising, and there are moments when she shows promise, but she is too much of a passive figure, and too much of a victim, to be a convincing character. The book is a good example of a well-illustrated, well-written, but ultimately disappointing children's book.

but she soon settles into being a very supportive companion for *Nicobobinus*, although very brave for a girl, she jumps and tears when things get on top of her. The narrative is fast to the point of being frantic. Almost every chapter ends on a note of background suspense—"Nicobobinus stepped into the amazing room he'd ever seen" for example, or, "Rosie suddenly found herself pulled into the faces of the most evil looking men she'd ever seen in her life". The author intrudes playfully into the narrative from time to time, and gives himself a role in the events, rather forced way.

Nicobobinus and Rosie's adventures are amusingly various, but the book's descriptions are so bizarre, that there is a note of the absurd in one scene, for example, a dragon leaping into a rainbow lake and until they are into one another and form "a wide sparkling cauldron" across the rainbow water. The strange castle that still span [sic] slowly toward and round in the centre. The most convincing parts of the book—and the funniest—are in which Terry Jones settles into a satirical, hypocritical, piratical mode, for example, when he plans to kill *Nicobobinus* by sending him to an iron cage over an immense fire, while rats gnaw through the crucial bit of rope that holds the cage door shut. And so that the monks themselves will not put it, he is stained with the guilt of a child's death.

The narrative climax of the book is a collision of men and dragons. But it is not as exciting as a passing interest in the collision, because the dragons belong to a completely to a world of fantasy in which characters are very thin on the ground, and the episode has no developed significance either: there is no sense of what is at stake in the battle, and the book is a good example of a well-illustrated, well-written, but ultimately disappointing children's book.

Academic freedom and the perils of sponsorship

continued from page 164

matter. There were prolonged and heated debates in various university committees and in the Senate as to the propriety of Toynbee's conduct. By and large, the academic members of the Senate sided with Toynbee, and he had a particularly strong champion in Professor Graham Wallas of the LSE. The principal of the university, however, and a sizeable group of lay members, including Canon J. A. Douglas, the secretary of the Crusade for the Redemption of Saint Sophia, were in the opposing camp. One member of the anti-Toynbee faction, indeed, was to argue that the academic freedom of a professor did not imply a license to behave like a cad. After much agonized, and frequently acrimonious debate, in both college and university, the matter was resolved when, in late 1923, Toynbee submitted his resignation. This was to take effect in July 1924 at the end of the initial five-year term to which he had been appointed. His decision was a courageous one, given that he had no certainty of another job and that he had a young family to support.

The only condition which Toynbee had attached to his resignation was that he should be free to make a public statement about the circumstances of his departure. This he did in a letter to *The Times* on January 3, 1924. In this he pointed out that he had first offered to resign as early as May 1921 and emphasized that he had been quite unaware of the conditions attaching to the chair until the fourth year of his tenure. Had he learnt of them on the day of his appointment then he would have withdrawn. Had he learnt of them at Yalova in Asia Minor, on May 24, 1921, when he had first encountered direct evidence of Greek atrocities, he would have done precisely what he had done since then. He concluded with a quotation (which was not published) from Polybius to the effect that only the truth was acceptable in a chronicle of public events.

The letter in *The Times* brought the dispute into the open and provoked a further flurry of controversy. But most press comment was favourable to Toynbee. *The Yorkshire Observer*, for instance, denounced the University of London as a "stronghold of Greco-phillism". One particularly stirring defence of Toynbee and the principle of academic freedom, cou-

pled with an attack on the university for accepting an endowment with unacceptable strings attached, appeared in *The Nation and Athenaeum*. Published anonymously, it had been written by Gilbert Murray.

Soon after his resignation had become public knowledge, Toynbee, in a curious twist to the tale, was approached by the Turkish minister in London with the offer of a post in the University of Istanbul. As the minister put it, Toynbee's name was universally esteemed on account of his services to the Turkish cause. On his latest visit to Turkey, Toynbee had been nobbed with a number of the leaders of the independence struggle and had spent one unprofitable evening trying to convince a sceptical and whisky-swilling Atatürk of the paramount importance of personal relations in both public and private life. Toynbee did not turn down the Turkish government's offer out of hand, but soon afterwards his old mentor in the Foreign Office, Sir James Headlam-Morley, came to the rescue with a commission to write an annual survey of international affairs for Chatham House.

Although the subscribers were now rid of Toynbee, they none the less felt aggrieved that he had been allowed to resign with what they considered to be the mildest of rebukes on the part of the university, namely a Senate resolution to the effect that the subscribers' committee had been fully justified in deploring "the circumstances which had imperilled the continuance of the Koraeas chair". The subscribers did not, however, as they were entitled to, call for the return of the endowment, although at least one member of the committee regarded the continuance of the chair as a complete waste of money.

Some adroit diplomacy by the principal of the university, Sir Edwin Cooper Perry, who believed the subscribers to have been "wounded in the house of friends", resulted in a revision of the terms of the original endowment. This was handed over to the university in perpetuity. But if the university now had control of the purse strings and the subscribers had lost their right to make representations about the work of the department, in one crucial respect the influence of the donors over the chair actually increased under the new dis-

pensation. The subscribers now had the right to nominate two of their number as members of the Board of Advisers who would advise the Senate on the appointment of a new professor.

The two subscribers' representatives involved in the election of Toynbee's successor were Joannes Gennadius, who at the time of the first election had been primarily concerned to root out heresy on the language question, and John Mavrogordato, an Anglo-Greek who was subsequently to be appointed Bywater and Sotheby Professor of Byzantine and Modern Greek at Oxford. The electors' choice was F. H. Marshall, reader in classics at Birkbeck College, London. His interests in the Byzantine and Ottoman periods were to prove uncontroversial, doubtless to the relief of the college and university authorities. Only during the early 1960s was the right of the subscribers and their successors to a say in the appointment of the Koraeas Professor formally terminated.

In his old age, Toynbee was able to take a relaxed view of his stormy tenure of the Koraeas chair. He dismissed the incident as ancient history and showed no inclination to try to apportion blame for the contretemps. He was grateful for the fact that a resignation that was only in a formal sense voluntary had paved the way for his career at Chatham House, the annual surveys of international affairs and, eventually, *The Study of History*. Indeed, it is difficult to envisage his restless historical imagination being long confined even by the relatively generous strait-jacket of Byzantine and modern Greek studies.

Toynbee's brief tenure of the chair, however, and his dogged faithfulness to the precept *audiam pariter*, were to give rise to a masterpiece in *The Western Question in Greece and Turkey*. This is without doubt one of the most remarkable books in his vast oeuvre and, even after the passage of sixty years, remains essential reading for anyone who would hope to understand the roots of the present impasse between Greece and Turkey. Moreover, at a time when the spirit of Grindrod lies heavily over the universities, the Toynbee imbroglio is a salutary reminder of the fact that, even if he who pays the piper does not always call the tune, he all too frequently tries to.

Sale of books and MSS

H. R. Woudhuysen

In New York on February 7 Christie's were selling the first part of the library of James Gilvary (a second selection of books will be auctioned by the Swann Galleries there on March 27). By profession a concert promoter, Gilvary was of Irish extraction and began collecting in the 1930s, concentrating on Irish and French literature; the modern movement and its precursors. His taste was catholic and while he was especially drawn to Joyce, Henry James and Yeats, he also found room for detective novels (a first edition of Chandler's *The Big Sleep* fetched \$2,200 against an estimate of \$800), and had already begun to collect Seamus Heaney and Samuel Beckett's most recent works. With a short foreword by Robert Milder, illustration of the Grouper Club, the New York society for bibliophiles of which Gilvary was an enthusiastic and long-standing member, the catalogue is a record of a fine and essentially modest library, collected with good taste and sure judgment.

The largest part of the sale was devoted to Yeats and consisted of just over one hundred lots. In general prices were double their high estimates. As well as first editions (including Yeats's prodigiously rare first book *Mosses*, a first edition of \$14,000-\$18,000), and, as expected, Gilvary particularly liked to collect presentation and association copies, and many of these Yeats letters were not only signed by Allan Wade in his edition of the *Complete Poems* of 1957, but will go down to posterity as part of the complete correspondence. Of these unpublished letters most were to Yeats's two "work" and "business" correspondents, Dr Frank Harris, however, he wrote a more personal word, having just written *Life and Love*, which he described as "a vulgar and immoral" story. Your

book makes me too full of regret that I did not live your life as well as my own" and in a letter from New York he tells the Duchess of Sutherland, "I think we poets would all write the most admirable poetry if governments would shut us up in American trains and keep us ever on the road and give us nothing but American newspapers to read."

There were a few literary manuscripts in this part of the sale, most notably a typescript of the revised acting version of *The Countess Cathleen*, with autograph notes by Yeats and Lady Gregory, which sold for \$3,500 (estimate \$3,000-\$5,000), a copy of *Deirdre*, 1907, with manuscript revisions, which also went for \$3,500, a corrected draft of the poem "The Folly of being Comforted" and a copy of "Peace" with an inscription to Ezra Pound. Pound's copy of *Reveries over Childhood*, presented by Yeats to Pound in 1916, the year of its publication, fetched \$2,200.

Gilvary's second largest collection was of Henry James material, which he began to seek out in the 1930s, when James's reputation had somewhat faded. Again, Gilvary was able to acquire an extraordinary number of presentation copies, first editions and letters, most of which do not appear in Leon Edel's four volumes, nor in the various other collections of James's correspondence. Among the association copies were books given to James by Turgenyev, Alphonse Daudet (his *Sapho*), and H. G. Wells—*The Passionate Friends* (an unpublished title in view of their later quarrel), fortunate in 1913. Apart from a presentation copy of his second book *Transatlantic Sketches*, edited by Allan Wade in his edition of the *Complete Poems* of 1957, but will go down to posterity as part of the complete correspondence. Of these unpublished letters most were to Yeats's two "work" and "business" correspondents, Dr Frank Harris, however, he wrote a more personal word, having just written *Life and Love*, which he described as "a vulgar and immoral" story. Your

quotations in the catalogue, included one sending the first instalment of *The Americanist* to the *Atlantic Weekly* in 1876 and one giving his impressions of London.

Finally, the Joyce items were particularly rich and important and they fetched correspondingly high prices. Gilvary's presentation copy of the first edition of *Ulysses*, printed on Dutch handmade paper, fetched \$35,000, against an estimate of \$20,000-\$30,000. An autograph copy of thirty-three of the thirty-six poems in *Chamber Music* fetched \$90,000, against an estimate of \$4,500-\$6,500, and twenty-four heavily revised pages of "The Mookse and the Grippe" episode from *Finnegans Wake*, which appeared in *Transition* magazine fetched \$120,000, against an estimate of \$20,000-\$30,000.

Among the French items in the sale were letters, first editions and presentation copies from Flaubert, Gide, Huysmans, Mallarmé, Proust and Valéry. There were some fine and very patetic letters from Claire ("any thing quiet and melancholy suits me if I could get my head right I should do for if I could read or write or even remember what I have done or know I feel as myself I should do, but to be in this waking dream is almost unbearable"), and from Christopher Smart, written to Dr Burney from the King's Bench Prison which sold for \$7,500. Walter Pater's rather protean advice to Arthur Symonds on the publication of his first book of poems failed to reach its estimate of \$700-\$900, and was sold for \$650. Four quite weighty letters from Gerard Manley Hopkins to an Anglican priest, which were expected to go for as much as \$6,000, went for \$4,000. A presentation copy of Evelyn Waugh's *Essay on the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood* inscribed to his teacher J. F. Roxburgh, "this insignificant and much misprinted essay from an old but still grateful pupil" fetched \$6,500. These prices do not include the buyer's premium.

INDEX OF BOOKS REVIEWED

- Al Hakim, Tawfiq. *The Return of Consciousness* 159
An Inventory of the Histrical Monuments in the County of Northampton: Volume VI, Architectural monuments in North Northamptonshire 168
Baynes, Pauline. *How Dog Began* 174
Bellamy, Gay. *The Nudists* 162
Blume, Judy. *The Pain and the Great One* 174
Böhl, Heinrich. *Frauen vor Flusslandschaft* 173
Bolton, Barbara. *Edward Wilkins and his friend Gwendoline* 174
Braun, Valter. *Hinze-Kunze-Roman* 173
Bryson, John. *Evil Angels: The death of Azaria Chamberlain in the central Australian desert, and the events leading to judgement* 187
Camp, William. *Stroke Counterstroke* 162
Carter, Jimmy. *The Blood of Abraham: Inside the Middle East* 160
Castronovo, David. *Edmund Wilson* 170
Christian, R. F. (Editor and Translator). *Tolstoy's Diaries* 155
Cress, Nigel. *The Common Writer: Life in nineteenth-century Crub Street* 171
Daly, Niki. *Not So Fast Songololo* 174
Davies, Peter. *The Last Election* 162
De Krey, Gary Stuart. *A Fractured Society: The politics of London in the first age of party 1688-1715* 169
Dickinson, Mary. *Jilly*, *You Look Terrible* 174
Dietorow, E. L. *World's Fair* 163
Dewey, Alan. *Middle East Crisis: U. S. Decision-making in 1958, 1970 and 1973* 168
Fancher, Raymond E. *The Intelligence Men: Makers of the IQ controversy* 158
Grindley, Sally. *Knock Knock Who's There?* 174
Helm, Christoph. *Homs Ende* 173
Herriot, James. *Only One Woolf* 174
Ishiguro, Kazuo. *An Artist of the Floating World* 162
Israel, Raphael. *Man of Defiance: A political biography of Anwar Sadat* 159
Jones, Andrew. *Britain's Economy: The roots of stagnation* 161
Jones, Terry. *Nicobobinus* 174
Karlin, Simon. *Russian Drama from its Beginnings to the Age of Pushkin* 166
Kapel, Gilles. *The Prophet and Pharaoh: Muslim extremism in Egypt* 159
Kostof, Spiro. *A History of Architecture: Settings and Rituals* 168
Lanz, Siegfried. *Exercitplatz* 173
Lobe, Mira. *Christopher Wants a Party* 174
McCabe, Colin. *Theoretical Essays: Film, Linguistics, Literature* 170
Mackay, Shena. *Redhill Rococo* 163
Moore, Inga. *The Truffle Hunter* 174
Paula, Roger. *Ludwig Tleck: A literary biography* 172
Prater, John. *The Gift* 174
Rayner, Mary. *Crocodarling* 174
Robinson, Portia. *The Hatch and Brood of Time: A study of the first generation of native-born white Australians 1788-1828: Volume One* 157
Seabrook, Jeremy. *Landscapes of Poverty* 161
Serebriakoff, Victor. *Mensie: The society for the biphyletic* 158
Snape, Juliet and Charles. *Where Do the Wicked Witches Live?* 174
Spiegel, Steven L. *The Other Arab-Israeli Conflict: Making America's Middle East policy, from Truman to Reagan* 160
Stableford, Brian. *Scientific Romance in Britain 1890-1950* 171
Tompkins, Jane. *Sensational Designs: The cultural work of American fiction 1790-1860* 170
Van Alaburgh, Chris. *The Mysteries of Harris Burdick* 174
Wander, Michele. *Quests in the Body* 162
Wassner, Richard. *Recovery from Schizophrenia: Psychiatry and political economy* 158
Zaitow, Charlotte. *I Know A Lady* 174

The October 1985 issue of the *Yale University Library Gazette* (ISSN 0044 0175) is largely taken up with considerations of the remains of a fifteenth-century schoolmaster's book now in the Beinecke Library at Yale. It was written originally perhaps in Lincolnshire, and Linda Voights and Barbara Sballor describe its recovery from a neglected box of miscellaneous manuscript fragments. In another article, Nicholas Orme writes more generally about the teaching of Latin in grammar schools in England during the later Middle Ages.

D. McK.